

CH
B-61
SEATTLE
WEST
LIBRARY
4075
SEATTLE
LIBRARY
STEVENSON
WASH

RNP B-160
SEATTLE HIGH
SCHOOL

Current History

AUGUST, 1961

FOR READING TODAY . . . FOR REFERENCE TOMORROW

1ST SEATTLE HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY
FOR NIGHT ONLY

Problems of American Education

What Is Government's Role?

THE PROS AND CONS OF FEDERAL AID TO PUBLIC EDUCATION

Van Cleve Morris 65

FEDERAL AID FOR PRIVATE AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS? YES

Neil G. McCluskey, S.J. 70

FEDERAL AID FOR PRIVATE AND PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS? NO

Leo Pfeffer 77

FINANCING PUBLIC EDUCATION *Seymour E. Harris* 82

REGIONAL PROBLEMS IN AMERICAN EDUCATION . *Austin D. Swanson* 87

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION IN THE SOUTH *Henry J. Abraham* 94

PHYSICAL PLANT PROBLEMS IN EDUCATION . . . *Chris A. De Young* 97

THE PERMANENT TEACHER SHORTAGE *Otto Krash* 102

HAWAII: EQUALIZATION THROUGH CENTRALIZATION

Hubert V. Everly 108

CURRENT DOCUMENTS

The Catholic Statement on a Separate School Loan Bill 114

Text of Lutheran Statement on School Aid 115

RECEIVED AT OUR DESK 116

THE MONTH IN REVIEW 118

Current History

Founded in 1914 by
The New York Times

Published by
Current History, Inc.

Editor, 1943-1955:
D. G. REDMOND

AUGUST, 1961

Volume 41 Number 240

Publisher:
DANIEL G. REDMOND, JR.

Editor:
CAROL L. THOMPSON

Assistant Editor:
JOAN L. BARKON

Promotion Consultant:
MARY A. MEEHAN

Contributing Editors

ROSS N. BERKES
University of Southern California

SIDNEY B. FAY
Harvard University

MICHAEL T. FLORINSKY
Columbia University

HANS W. GATZKE
The Johns Hopkins University

NORMAN A. GRAEBNER
University of Illinois

OSCAR HANDLIN
Harvard University

STEPHEN D. KERTESZ
University of Notre Dame

HANS KOHN
City College of New York

NORMAN D. PALMER
University of Pennsylvania

CARROLL QUIGLEY
Georgetown University

JOHN P. ROCHE
Brandeis University

A. L. ROWSE
All Souls College, Oxford

HARRY R. RUDIN
Yale University

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN
Williams College

RICHARD VAN ALSTYNE
University of Southern California

COLSTON E. WARNE
Amherst College

Book Review Editor:
ALVIN Z. RUBINSTEIN
University of Pennsylvania

85 cents a copy: \$7.50 a year.
Canada \$7.75 a year. Foreign in-
cluding the Philippines \$8.25 a year.

Coming Next Month...

COMMUNIST CHINA AND THE COMMUNITY OF NATIONS

September, 1961

In the fall, we begin a study of the nations of the world with our September issue on Communist China. In this issue seven specialists devote themselves to an analysis of Chinese problems, domestic and foreign. Articles include:

THE CHINESE-RUSSIAN RIVALRY by *Harold H. Fisher*, Professor of International Relations, San Francisco State College, and author of "The Communist Revolution";

CHINA'S DEVELOPING IMPERIALISM by *Frank N. Trager*, Professor of International Affairs, New York University, and author of "Marxism in Southeast Asia";

CHINA'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, by *Yuan-li Wu*, Director, Institute for Asian Studies, Marquette University, and author of "An Economic Survey of Communist China";

CHINESE COMMUNIST EDUCATION by *Theodore H. E. Chen*, Professor of Asiatic Studies, University of Southern California;

GOVERNMENT AND LAW IN COMMUNIST CHINA by *Shen-Yu Dai*, Staff Member, Research Project on Men and Politics in Modern China, Columbia University;

COMMUNIST CHINA'S MILITARY STRENGTH by *Allan S. Nanes*, Analyst in United States Foreign Policy, Library of Congress; and

CHINA AND THE UNITED NATIONS by *Sheldon Appleton*, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University.

Published monthly by Current History, Inc., Publication Office, 1822 Ludlow St., Phila. 3, Pa. Editorial Office, Wolfpit Rd., Norwalk, Conn. Entered as second class matter May 12, 1943, at the post office at Philadelphia, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Indexed in *The Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*. Individual copies may be secured by writing to the publication office. No responsibility is assumed for the return of unsolicited manuscripts. Copyright, 1961, by Current History, Inc.

WEST SEATTLE HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY

Current History

Vol. 41

AUGUST, 1961

No. 240

American education today faces many new challenges. Some of its major problems are discussed in these pages, as educators and historians evaluate our schools and their goals. Will federal aid help to solve our current educational problems? "Those in favor of federal aid proposals customarily advance five major arguments: (1) the Ideological Argument, (2) the Social Argument, (3) the Politico-Military Argument, (4) the Fiscal Argument, (5) the Historical Argument." On the other hand, "Those opposed to federal aid measures have argued their case with equal firmness. Since their general position is one of objection to a relatively new political idea, their specific arguments can be classified as rebuttals to the above positions." Both cases are outlined in our introductory article.

The Pros and Cons of Federal Aid to Public Education

By VAN CLEVE MORRIS

Professor of Education, Rutgers University

THE IDEA of federal aid is as old as Plato. In *The Republic*, a book which might be called the first best-seller in political and educational theory, Plato scandalized his countrymen by bringing off a shot-gun marriage of education and government. Education, he claimed, has a vital political function to perform in maintaining a free and democratic society, and, for this reason, the schools of the state should serve as a special arm of government.

While Western European countries, with their centralized educational ministries, have not seen fit to dispute this notion, we in the United States have always put up a stiff defense against this subversive idea of Plato's when it comes to running our schools. Jefferson, for example, once uttered the very quotable epigram: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be," but he never got very far in the Virginia legislature in the 1790's, with his Platonic

recommendation that the state of Virginia subsidize the full cost of the education of Virginia's ablest youngsters. Historically we have been reluctant to follow Jefferson on this principle and have left education in the hands of local authorities.

Nevertheless, as the world shrinks and the nation-state becomes a more intimate community, there is a growing sentiment that the central government must show a continuing interest in the quality of its schools and that this interest is best expressed through disbursements from the federal treasury.

The Constitutional Question

No one knows whether federal aid is or is not constitutional. It has never been tested in the courts. Part of the trouble lies in the fact that the Constitution makes no mention of education whatsoever. Historians differ on the significance of this omission. Some claim that education was deliberately omitted and that the Tenth Amendment, by indirec-

tion, indicated it as one of those powers "reserved to the states." Others contend that the question never came up because, at the time of the Constitutional Convention, we had not yet had any experience with universal education and the matter of its control never occurred to anyone.

The constitutional question, not only in education but elsewhere also, is frequently left undecided because there is no practical way to bring such questions into the courts. According to the "doctrine of standing," a plaintiff in a legal suit must be able to show that he is being personally injured or disadvantaged by a governmental action. Since it is virtually impossible to demonstrate personal injury in such large scale proposals as federal aid to education, it is likely that the constitutional question will be a long time undecided.

Nevertheless, there seems to be widespread agreement that the constitutional question is not of primary importance, and that if the nation wishes to enact federal aid measures, it may do so.

The Pros

Those in favor of federal aid proposals customarily advance five major arguments: (1) the Ideological Argument, (2) the Social Argument, (3) the Politico-Military Argument, (4) the Fiscal Argument, (5) the Historical Argument.

The Ideological Argument—A great many people will vote favorably for *any* educational measure. To these people, the entire institution we have come to call public education is a bulwark of democracy. Therefore, it does not matter too much who pays for it just so long as it is provided in abundance. Therefore, if the suggestion is made that more and better education can be provided through grants from the federal government, then we should by all means provide for them.

The Social Argument—As a general rule, arguments like the above are considered flimsy; they are not enough. Therefore, there is the further and more specific argument that public education directly benefits the community—economically, socially, morally—and that it is in the public interest to see to it that every child receives an education. We have already adopted the principle

that everyone should pay for education whether or not he has children of his own. In accepting this principle, we have tacitly recognized that a child's schooling is not merely a private privilege but a public duty. And if getting an education is a public duty, then it becomes everybody's business.

Now, then, if there are youngsters in the United States who, because they were born in the "wrong" state, are being deprived of a complete education, then it is the duty of the federal government to step in and equalize educational opportunity wherever necessary. It is a sociological fact that the states with the lowest income produce the most children and that the high-income states are the urban, northeastern states which produce relatively fewer children. This accounts for the fact that during the year 1960-1961 Alabama was able to spend only \$217 per pupil whereas the state of New York, for example, was able to spend approximately \$585 per pupil. This discrepancy of approximately 3 to 1 tends to produce a similar discrepancy in the quality of the schools in these states and, hence, an equivalent discrepancy in the opportunities open to youngsters living in these states. The argument is therefore advanced that since equality of opportunity is one of the fundamental principles on which our democracy rests, the federal government should equalize education throughout the country by taxing the wealth wherever it may be found and disbursing the wealth wherever needed for education.

The Politico-Military Argument—There is no question that the United States is now engaged in a strategic struggle to maintain its position of leadership in the world of nations. What makes our present time different from earlier periods of trouble and tumult is the new role of intelligence in nation survival. Brainpower is now the great national resource of every major nation. At this brainpower must be identified, trained and enlightened throughout the several levels of our society if we are to maintain our position in the world. This brainpower does not restrict itself merely to special aptitudes—science and mathematics—an emphasis which was a reflex action to Soviet sputnik—but includes all of the major areas of learning including the social sciences and the humanities.

Now that war is total, and the world struggle itself is total, we cannot settle for anything less than a total educational effort. Since local municipalities seem unable to support their educational systems on a magnitude considered essential for national safety, and since the several states also seem either unable or unwilling to meet their obligation in providing higher quality education, it is imperative that the federal government, acting for the nation, meet the emergency with forthright action.

The Fiscal Argument—The real reason for local municipalities and individual states being unable, so they claim, to support their schools is that they have exhausted the taxable wealth of their own communities. Historically, we have built our educational system on the basis of the real-property tax in the belief that real property is the basis of our economy. Although it once was, it is no longer. The wealth of the people of the United States is now held in other forms: stocks, bonds, investments and securities, bank balances, capital goods, profits, salaries, and wages. The fact is that the local municipality has no access to these forms of wealth. And while the several states theoretically enjoy taxing powers against these several forms of wealth, they have customarily been reluctant to use these powers for fear of driving away commerce and industry, whose absence is felt in the placing of a heavier tax burden upon individual citizens. In short, the property tax is no longer adequate to maintain our schools and therefore the fiscal support of our schools must pass out of the hands of local communities and into the hands of larger and larger political entities, most particularly the federal government, which have 'earned how to tax the wealth of our people.

The Historical Argument—Whether or not federal aid is constitutional, there is certainly a great deal of precedent for it. The Northwest Ordinance of 1785 provided for grants of land for educational purposes west of the Ohio River to states being formed out of the Northwest Territory. These lands, the sixteenth section of every township, were given to the states and the proceeds therefrom were to be used for educational purposes. The Morrill Act of 1862, one of President Lincoln's mid-Civil War measures designed to strengthen the Union forces,

called for a grant of land to each state, based upon congressional representation, for the establishment of colleges for the teaching of "agriculture and the mechanic arts." It is out of this notable piece of legislation that we have developed our several "A. and M." colleges and so-called "land-grant" institutions.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, and the other war-time acts, provided for federal subsidies for the teaching of vocational agriculture, manual trades and home economics in the nation's high schools and colleges. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 provided for direct grants to the schools and colleges for the teaching of mathematics, foreign language and the establishment of guidance programs. Although all the twentieth century precedents concern *specific* subject matters of interest to the federal government, there is nothing to suggest in this history that *general* outlays to the schools would be out of keeping with our national experience.

The Cons

Those opposed to federal aid measures have argued their case with equal firmness. Since their general position is one of objection to a relatively new political idea, their specific arguments can be classified as rebuttals to the above positions.

The Ideological Rebuttal—There is a sizable number of people in the United States who are opposed to public education in principle. If schooling is so important to democratic citizens, and this is not denied, then it should be the obligation of each individual to supply it for himself. It is unfair and undemocratic to expect citizens who have worked hard to earn their way in the world to subsidize the education of other people's children. Therefore, any proposal which would expand the measure of public assistance to education is to be regarded as an unhealthy, possibly even socialistic, development in American political life. Each individual should be expected to pay for his own education. If he is unable to pay, there are a plentiful number of scholarships and sources of assistance available to help him.

The Rebuttal to Social Egalitarianism—Closely related to the above argument is the companion notion that, while public schools are necessary to guarantee an equal start in

life for our citizens, they should not be expected to provide a free education at advanced levels to those who will gain personally. To attempt to equalize opportunity on a massive scale, such as federal aid proposals mean to do, is essentially to penalize the industrious and favor the slothful. In concrete terms, it means that we penalize the energetic and creative people in New York and Connecticut in order to aid the ne'er-do-wells and indolent loafers in Mississippi. There is no child in the United States today who cannot get a good education if he really wants one. Our schools are already over-full of slackers and troublemakers who are not taking advantage of the educational opportunities now available to them.

If a state or a municipality believes that its children are being disadvantaged, then the obligation to correct the situation should fall directly on that state or municipality. If the people want a better education for their youngsters, let them provide it from their own pocketbooks instead of asking someone else to do it for them.

The Politico-Military Rebuttal—There is no disagreement about our being in a struggle for survival in a dangerous world situation. Nor is there disagreement with the view that brainpower is the basic resource of a civilized nation. The question lies more in how best to advance and train this brainpower. The people who run our schools are as aware as any bureaucrat in Washington of what is at stake in the world struggle. They do not need to be told by a central ministry of education what to teach or how to teach it. Nor do they need to be told to spend more of their resources on education. The citizens in the several states are free to provide whatever education they consider essential in today's world. If this education is considered inadequate, then there is nothing to stop the citizens of the several states from improving it. In short, we do not need direction from Washington to correct whatever may be wrong with the quality of our educational program in all of the 50 states.

It is too often forgotten that in the politico-military struggle now going on in the world the precious contribution of the American way-of-life is not so much economic power or sheer military might as it is the idea of liberty and self-determination. If we were

to surrender the locally supported school—the last great outpost of self-determination—we would compromise our moral image in the world.

The Fiscal Rebuttal—It is true that the property tax bears the primary load of our nation's schools. But there is nothing standing in the way of states and municipalities to increase these taxes or to levy new taxes to pay for their own schools. A majority of the school districts in this country have not yet reached the limits of their bonding capacity and, furthermore, there is nothing to prevent states and municipalities from extending their bonding capacity and raising their own taxes to pay for the kind of schools they need.

We seem to forget that the country's wealth is held by the citizens themselves. This wealth at any given moment is a given figure and can be taxed as readily at the local and state levels as it can at the federal level. While it is true that local and state taxes are relatively more expensive to collect than federal taxes, the enormous bureaucratic apparatus necessary to disburse federal funds back to the citizens themselves eats up a sizable portion of the original tax revenue dollar. If we need better schools, federal aid is the least efficient and most wasteful way to get them.

If it is felt that states and municipalities do not have access to those forms of wealth especially personal and corporate incomes so successfully taxed by the federal government, Senator Goldwater of Arizona has suggested that the federal income tax be revised to provide for refunds to those citizens whose states or municipalities increase their tax for school purposes. In this way, the taxin powers of the federal government are mad available indirectly to local and state taxin units.

The Historical Rebuttal—The so-calle historical precedents for federal aid are not authentic precedents. The land grants under the Northwest Ordinance were part of a much larger program of grants to farmer merchants, railroads, and so on, to bri people to settle the western frontier. These grants were therefore not actually feder aids to education so much as they were inducements to a reluctant populace to sett in the west. All of the other occasions o which the federal government has supporte

educational projects have had to do with specific needs almost always occasioned by a major war. Even the National Defense Education Act is a *defense* measure. None of the federal adventures into education provides the slightest argument of precedent for federal aid proposals now before the nation. These proposals would make the federal government a major partner in the general support and direction of our educational system. This we have never done before.

The Control Argument—In addition to the above rebuttal to the Pro arguments the clinching Con argument is that federal aid to education will inevitably lead to federal control of the schools. What the federal government sponsors and supports, it has a right to direct and control. This has been the case with every sphere of social and political life which has come under the jurisdiction of federal agencies—river basin development, agriculture policy, labor-management relations, interstate commerce and communication, national banking and fiscal policy, and many others. We would be naive to think that federal control could be avoided in the present case. Indeed, in all of those alleged precedents from the Morrill Act to the present, the federal government has specified what subjects shall be taught as a condition for the making of grants. Certainly this is federal control of the curriculum in a most obvious sense. A massive federal aid program would only provide the invitation for the federal government to intrude its influence into the direction of educational policy throughout the several states; it would mean the specification of certain curricular programs, the recommendation of certain teaching methods, and possibly, eventually, the selection and dismissal of personnel. This

gradual encroachment of federal agencies into the running of our schools would be the inevitable result of federal assistance programs.

The Pro rebuttal to this argument is that federal aid and federal control can be separated and the latter avoided. It is true, of course, that land-grant colleges, for instance, must maintain certain programs in order to qualify for federal assistance, most particularly agricultural studies. Aside from these general specifications, however, land-grant institutions are operated and directed by their sponsoring states, and the federal government has nothing to do with what they teach, how they select their students and how they hire and dismiss their personnel. Wherever inappropriate federal interference may have been noted in the past, it has not been occasioned by the mere fact of federal aid to schools. In short, federal aid does not necessarily imply federal control.

The Ax Grinders

In recent years, federal aid proposals have been beset by arguments not directly related to the issue, two in particular: racial segregation and aid to Catholic parochial schools. Representative Adam Clayton Powell of New York City has persistently added amendments to recent federal aid bills calling for a denial of grants to school systems or institutions which are racially segregated. These famous "Powell Amendments" have contributed to the defeat of most of this kind of legislation. In the current year, Representative Powell has apparently agreed not to obstruct the Kennedy administration's proposals with such an amendment. And the official Administration position, as announced by Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is that the problem of racial segregation in schools is now being worked out in the courts and that it should not interfere in any way with federal aid plans.

More recently, the Catholic hierarchy has made it clear that unless federal aid of some sort is made available to Catholic parochial schools, they will be forced to oppose all federal aid measures. The problem of aid to private and parochial schools is discussed

Van Cleve Morris specializes in educational philosophy and the social and historical foundations of education at Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey. A Ford Fellow during the academic year 1953-1954, he has written for journals in the field of educational theory and earlier this year published *Philosophy and the American School* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.).

(Continued on page 76)

In the defense of federal aid to private and parochial schools, this authority writes that there must be room for both systems: "The public schools will continue to exist, and they will continue to be supported by all citizens. But if democracy and freedom of choice are to mean anything at all, the nonpublic schools must also be kept alive and healthy."

Federal Aid for Private and Parochial Schools? Yes

By NEIL G. MCCLUSKEY, S.J.

Dean of the School of Education, Gonzaga University

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY ONE will be remembered as the year that rekindled the great debate over public support of children in nonpublic schools.¹ Two new factors in the current debate, however, are providing a special fillip. One is the presence in the White House of the first Catholic ever elected to the presidency. The other is the new articulate role being assumed by the Catholic laymen and laywomen across the country. What used to be viewed as—and to a large extent was—a clerically run operation and responsibility has become something much broader. Hundreds of thousands of Catholic parents in scores of communities are organizing themselves in order to make their case to the public in tones that are clear, strong and lay. At no other time have the mothers and fathers of parochial school children so clearly identified themselves with the Catholic schools—the schools that their own money has built and that house millions of their children.

Father McCluskey is presently on leave from his duties as associate editor of *America* (national Catholic weekly review), to serve at Gonzaga University. For several years he has been *America's* staff specialist on Black African Affairs. His books include *Public Schools and Moral Education* and *Catholic Viewpoint on Education*.

Debate is good. Airing social grievances is good, for it is certainly an unhealthy condition when an important segment of a society feels itself the victim of social injustice, and simmers and sulks in an aggrieved silence. It would indeed be distressing to find one day on our shores that painful European phenomenon, the making and unmaking of governments over the issue of support for religious schools. Evoking as it does such deep-seated loyalties and ancient animosities, this issue is as highly charged emotionally as the question of racial segregation. If for no other reason, then, the present debate must go on—but in calm and restrained terms.

Unhappily, the school question has not always been approached with the responsibility it warrants. The historical complexities and subtleties with which the issue has been befooled since the 1840's are often ignored. Even the terms of the debate lose their crispness. We exchange the same old slogans and clichés. We aim broadsides at positions that either were never held or that have long since been abandoned or substantially modified. We argue loudly and with impeccable logic but from premises that are miles apart—and we stay miles apart. Catholic parent will not settle this issue by a simple appeal to constitutional rights. Nor will the opposition wave the problem away by quoting

¹ Only eight out of some 250 religious groups, other than the Catholic Church, have established school systems of any size. In the aggregate these enroll about 500,000 pupils. Since near 90 per cent of the nonpublic school, subcollegiate enrollment in Catholic private or parochial schools, the present article will treat mainly of them.

what they think Madison or Jefferson meant by the wall of separation of Church and State.

No, the school question will not be solved simply by applying the old formulas or shouting the old battlecries that held through the nineteenth and into the twentieth century. For one thing, the pattern of American education has substantially changed. The sheer dimensions of the nonpublic school system—which is 90 per cent Catholic—make its needs and interests more than the concern of the groups immediately sponsoring it. This is the first argument in favor of public support for all schools.²

Size of the Catholic School Population

There are 5.4 million pupils in the Catholic private and parochial schools or approximately 14 per cent of the nation's total elementary and secondary school population.³ But that figure of 14 per cent doesn't tell the real story. In dozens of towns and suburban communities, the Catholic schools enroll 40, 50 and even in some cases 60 per cent of the school population. One-half the children of Green Bay, Wisconsin, and 52 per cent of the Manchester, New Hampshire, children are in Catholic schools. The Catholic school systems in many of the largest cities of the United States enroll one quarter or more of the total school population. In Detroit it is 23 per cent and in Philadelphia, 39 per cent. The figure for Hartford is 24 per cent; for Cincinnati, 28; for Boston, 30; for Milwaukee and New Orleans, 33; for Buffalo, 40; for Pittsburgh, 42. Every third school child in the cities of New York and Chicago is enrolled in a Catholic private or parochial school. In Cook and Lake Counties, the area comprising the Archdiocese of Chicago, there are 335,000 children in the elementary schools alone.

When a worried President Kennedy tells the American people that our progress as a nation "can be no swifter than our progress in education," neither he nor the total American community can exclude from their concern progress in the Catholic schools of Buffalo, Pittsburgh and New Orleans. The

quality of the education in these cities can be no better than the quality of the Catholic schools in them. It is inconceivable that the youthful talent of the nation can be adequately developed without the inclusion of nonpublic schools in government programs designed for this purpose.

As it presently stands, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is a good case in point. Title I, the preamble of the N.D.E.A., states the underlying philosophy of this important public law. In summary, it holds (1) that the security of the nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women, and (2) that we must increase our efforts to identify and educate more of the talent of the nation. But how are these assumptions interpreted in the remainder of the Act?

Title II provides for the cancellation of up to one half of any loan, plus interest, at a yearly rate of 10 per cent for college students who will enter full-time teaching in a *public* elementary or secondary school. No "forgiveness" of debt is accorded to interest future teachers in nonpublic schools, where the enrollment pressures and teaching needs are just as intense, if not more so.

According to the terms of Title III, the states receive outright grants for the acquisition of laboratory or other special equipment for instruction in science, mathematics and modern languages in *public* schools. Non-profit, nonpublic schools are permitted to borrow money from the government for these same purposes. Under the same title, the states are provided with grants for the expansion or improvement of supervisory services in foreign languages, but exclusively in *public* elementary and secondary schools or junior colleges. Yet, it is entirely possible that a rich proportion of the potential "brains" that the government sorely needs today in these fields lies in Catholic schools.

The same contradiction between the rhetoric of the preamble and actual provision is to be found in Title V which sets up grants to assist *public* secondary schools in their counseling and guidance programs. But what sense would an observer from the U.S.S.R. make out of the operation of this program in a place like Rhode Island, where 31 per cent of the state's elementary and sec-

² For a more complete treatment of this entire issue see the author's *Catholic Viewpoint on Education* (New York: Hanover House, 1959).

³ The two types of Catholic schools are distinct: parochial, under the control of a parish; private, under independent lay or religious control.

ondary school population is enrolled in parochial schools? The National Defense Education Act is projected for the defense of the American nation. During these critical years, when we cannot afford to leave any talent undeveloped wherever it is to be found, have not Catholic citizens the right to expect that government-supported programs in counseling, testing and guidance will include their children who happen to be in parochial schools? If the federal government, in the interests of our national defense and world leadership, is going to help local communities to identify, guide and subsidize student talent, should it not do so in a rational, comprehensive manner?

Nonpublic Schools Are American

In its simplest terms the issue comes down to one point: are nonpublic schools part of the American school system? To treat them in provision for national defense as if they were not requires what can only be called a cultivated myopia. Shall we be frank? Is not much of the opposition to support nonpublic schools rooted in that class of argument which calls parochial school education "divisive" or "un-American" or "undemocratic"? And shouldn't all these arguments conclude by demanding the suppression of these schools? The question is really not one of support. If the best interests of the American nation and the future of democracy depend uniquely on public school education (as it presently exists), then no competing system of schools should be tolerated, then we dare not let 42 of every 100 Pittsburgh school children remain outside the public schools. It is not the support of nonpublic schools that should be debated but the very propriety of their remaining in existence. But on the contrary, if citizens may fulfill the compulsory school law by sending their children to church-related schools, these schools and these children must be a part of the public concern.

When President Kennedy writes: "I am convinced that the national interest requires us to provide every child with an opportunity to develop his talents to their fullest," Catholic listeners wonder why this does not include their children. How can they be anything but puzzled when they know that the same crisis which the President and hundreds of

newspaper editorials describe as the compelling reason for federal assistance now to local communities exists in the Catholic schools at least as seriously as in the public schools. Increased enrollment, rising salaries and inflated building costs are not the monopoly of the public schools. No wall of separation of Church and state keeps these real problems from the Catholic schools.

Conscience and the Catholic Schools

A family seeking to follow simultaneously the dictates of conscience and the compulsory education law may not now, for all *practical* purposes, share in the state's provision for the common welfare. In the practical order, the state has set up what amounts to a religious test. Children in Catholic schools would qualify for free schooling and all related benefits provided by the state for its junior citizens except that their parents have placed them in a Catholic school. If public benefits are so administered that citizens must do violence to their conscience in order to share in them, then the benefits are discriminatory. Perhaps Catholic parents should look at things differently. Their feeling of frustration, however, is not assuaged by telling them that they are "free" to have their own schools, as they watch new and lavish subsidies for public schools steadily pricing Catholic school education out of the market.

Those who use the word "boycott" to stigmatize the choice Catholic parents freely make between the public and the Catholic school cannot be fully aware of the totalitarian logic of their position. Their starting assumption is that the state-established secular school has some claim on the primary allegiance of all citizens. In their book any citizen who, compelled by conscience, chooses to exercise his natural right to patronize his own school, becomes guilty of disloyalty to a state enterprise or of inflicting a "boycott" on the public schools. This is a strange reversal of values honored in both the Christian and American tradition. There is a primacy of spiritual values over the purely secular, and there is a priority of choice in this business of education which belongs basically to parents.

The family into which man is born has the primary right and obligation to educate him. This right is prior to the rights of civil and

ecclesiastical society because it is based on the natural relation of parents to their offspring which is the most basic in nature. Common sense, a venerable tradition in Western free society, and several important United States Supreme Court decisions would seem to have placed the priority of family right beyond dispute. Unhappily, with the state every year playing an increasing role in education, there are grounds for concern in our own country lest the school become just another agency of government. There are public school apologists and philosophers of education who simply take it for granted that since public education is under the immediate control of the state, it must exist for the sake of the state and be primarily a function reserved to the state.

It seems increasingly necessary to restate firmly that the United States Supreme Court has, on several occasions, unqualifiedly reaffirmed the principle that "the child is not the mere creature of the state" (*Pierce v. Society of Sisters*, 1925); and that "the custody, care and nurture of the child reside first in the parents" (*Prince v. Massachusetts*, 1944). Or to remind ourselves that unambiguous support for the primacy of the family right is likewise to be found in the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations (December 10, 1948): "Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children" (Article 26, 3).

Catholic citizens are not unaware of the values to be gained in the civic and social order by having their children enrolled in the common public school. They want to share in everything American that is good. On the other hand, they value more a religiously centered education which they are convinced cannot be had in the secularized public school. The billions of dollars they have devoted to building and staffing independent schools witness the depth of this conviction. The history of the American public school,

however, has made it painfully apparent that the American people have been caught in an unresolved ambiguity. They insist that the common schools assume a certain responsibility for character education. The 250 different religious bodies and the millions of unchurched Americans, however, are unable to agree on what should comprise character education or form the basis of a program for moral and spiritual values. These disagreements have by stages changed the ethical orientation of the American public school from Protestant to secular, but the result still leaves Catholic parents and educators unsatisfied.

This is not to blame the public school nor to suggest that its school staff is somehow derelict. Public school administrators and teachers did not create this problem; they inherited it and are helpless to cope satisfactorily with it. The central problem is of course the contradiction inherent in the very idea of one common school attempting to serve a religiously pluralistic society. Correlative to this problem is the place of the independent, church-related school in the total scheme of things and the claim this school has on public support. Thus far, we have discussed the arguments from public policy and priority of parental choice. We turn now to the constitutional argument.

The Constitutional Issue

The constitutional issue is easily stated: Can church-related schools share in any general provision for government aid to schools without violating the First Amendment to the Constitution? Or is such support forbidden because it would favor church groups with educational commitments over other groups, church and non-church, without them? Does the United States Congress have the authority to make funds available for religiously-related nonprofit schools in its legislation for the common good? Or does the prohibition in the First Amendment to the Constitution, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," extend to legislation which would incidentally promote the interests of Church-sponsored educational enterprises?⁴

Arthur E. Sutherland of the Harvard Law School has pointed out that there are only three sources of information on this subject: 1) the mind of the founding fathers who

⁴ Wilbur G. Katz, former dean of the University of Chicago's Law School, has observed: "It is clear that the Amendment was understood to forbid Congress not only to establish religion but also to interfere with the established churches still existing in several of the states. The general language 'no law respecting an establishment of religion' was probably chosen with this end primarily in view. This considerably reduces the force of the textual argument for the broad 'no aid' interpretation" (*Religion in America*, John Cogley, ed. (New York: Meridian Books, 1958), "The Case for Religious Liberty," pp. 101-02.

prepared the First Amendment; 2) the decisions of the United States Supreme Court which interpret the Amendment; 3) the actions of the different Congresses and Presidents in carrying out the Amendment.⁵

Regarding the first source, the difficulty of accurate inquiry is formidable. The senators and congressmen who authored the amendment, and the legislators from the dozen states that ratified it were indeed numerous. They represented sharply contrasting points of view in their political and religious philosophies. With regard to the deliberations of the constitutional convention itself, Professor Wilbur G. Katz has shrewdly observed, "It is possible that an ambiguous expression was intentionally chosen by the conference committee. Such want of candor is not unknown—even in ecclesiastical legislation." In any event, Professor Sutherland's comment is the pertinent one here, that "anyone who engages in this research may begin to doubt whether the Congress in 1961 should have its powers delimited by an uncertain guess at the frame of mind of men who lived 170 years ago." To know the thought of our forefathers on a given point of political philosophy is important, but more decisive elements may at times have to guide our social decisions.

A study of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court in cases involving church-state relations is the second source of light on the meaning of the "establishment" clause. Even greater ambiguity is to be found here than in a study of the full intentions of the founding fathers. There are few direct judgments regarding "establishment," and most of the incidental opinions or *obiter dicta* that have at times been expressed on this point can be juxtaposed to cancel one another out. As Mr. Sutherland has underlined: "While all lawyers properly pay respect to such dicta, still, statements of this sort, not directly relevant to the decision of the Court, do not carry the weight, as precedent, of an actual adjudication."

⁵ This study of Professor Sutherland's was prepared at the request of Representative John W. McCormack, House Majority Leader, March 13, 1961. *U.S. News & World Report* carries copious extracts in the April 3, 1961, issue.

It is amazing to contrast the scholarly doubts of eminent authorities in U.S. constitutional history on this subject with the absolute assurance of certain defenders of the "wall of separation" between Church and State.

⁶ Katz, p. 97.

⁷ Katz, p. 115.

From the third source, presidential and congressional action, comes a great variety of precedents in what concerns public support of church-related undertakings which are in the public service. Even a cursory study of how the First Amendment has been interpreted in practice by men sworn to uphold the Constitution removes any ambiguity about the meaning of the "no establishment" clause in the document. From the beginning of our national history, the federal and state governments have used public funds to support religion and religiously-sponsored enterprises on a nondiscriminatory basis. The evidence is unquestionable that on both national and state levels countless forms of co-operation between government and religion have been meshed into our political system. The interpretation of absolute separation would require the dismantling of all these arrangements, some of which go back to the cradle days of the American Republic. Even the proclamation of Thanksgiving Day each November by the President is an "aid" to religion, for it violates the alleged neutrality between believers and nonbelievers. Publishing the Thanksgiving Day proclamation requires money—and this obviously runs afoul of the supposed prohibition on the use of any tax, large or small, to support religious activities and institutions, whatever they may be labeled. Until the *Everson* case (1947) there had never been any serious acceptance of the claim that these practices violated the constitutional separation of church and state or were the equivalent of an establishment of religion.

The Cost of Religious Liberty

Separation of church and state has validity only as a means to an end. In other words, the principle of separation is instrumental and subordinate to the end—religious liberty. The concept of religious freedom will, accordingly, determine how much separation of church and state there should be. As Dr. Katz has pointedly reminded us: "Separation ordinarily promotes religious freedom; it is defensible so long as it does, and only so long."⁶ And the same authority reminds those who would make separation an end in itself that "the basic American principle of church-state relations is not separation but religious liberty."⁷

Many people fail completely to understand how Catholics can argue that their own religious liberty is involved here. They concede that Catholic parents and pastors have the right to establish and operate separate schools but they cannot see the basis of any additional right to have these schools financed in whole or in part from common tax funds. If any religious liberty is at stake, they feel, it is that of non-Catholics. Their sentiment is embodied in this statement of Justice Wiley B. Rutledge in his *Everson* dissent, that "Like St. Paul's freedom, religious liberty with a great price must be bought. And for those who exercise it most fully, by insisting on religious education for their children mixed with secular, by the terms of our Constitution the price is greater than for others."

But the issue of religious liberty is not so easily waved away, least of all by a price tag. In fact, this argument boomerangs. The last thing our founding fathers intended to do was to put a price on the religious liberty protected by the First Amendment that would put it beyond the reach of some citizens. But this is precisely what has happened, and this is precisely what pinpoints the Catholic grievance.

The states have passed compulsory school attendance laws, and to assist parents to comply with this legislation, have established a system of free public schools, but without any provision in them for religious training. To achieve the common good of accessible free education, the states tax all citizens alike to form a common pool for the support of education. As a result the states are able to provide for their school-age children the substantial benefit of free education and certain auxiliary benefits related to schooling. But more and more, for Catholic families of moderate or small means this can only take place within the type of school the state itself chooses. The higher school taxes are, the greater the squeeze on the poor

Catholic parent—and the less real freedom he has in choosing a school for his child.

Catholic parents judge that in all conscience they must try to send their children to a Catholic school. For Catholics believe that secular education during the child's formative years must be integrated with religious training. The Catholic parent looks to the public school not reproachfully but regretfully. As a policy statement issued only a few years ago by a commission of the N.E.A.-A.A.S.A. has solemnly told him, "As public institutions, the public schools of this nation must be nondenominational. They can have no part in securing acceptance of any one of the numerous systems of belief regarding a supernatural power and the relation of mankind thereto."⁸

Justice Robert H. Jackson of the United States Supreme Court even more dramatically expressed the grounds for Catholic uneasiness and gave the reason that above all justifies the existence of separate schools, when he wrote in his dissent in the *Everson* case: "Our public school, if not a product of Protestantism, at least is more consistent with it than with the Catholic culture and scheme of values."

Opponents of the Catholic case still press their contention that to take tax dollars from non-Catholic pockets to support Catholic schools would be an intolerable violation of religious liberty—their own. This argument is raised sincerely by many people. The temptation here is to make the quick retort that this is an absurd piece of fiscal logic, for public taxes must always go for policies adopted for the common good. Dollars from a Methodist teetotaler might be paying for an embassy cocktail party, a pacifist's dollars might be paying for the latest Polaris missile. After all, where does an argument like this end?

The principle here, however, is that legislation is not void if it achieves a public purpose, even though in the process a private end is incidentally aided. Education and its auxiliary services are public benefits to the individual citizen. "There is no requirement that the church should be a liability to those of its citizens who are at the same time citizens of the state, and entitled to privileges and benefits as such."⁹

The courts have made it clear that the

⁸ National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission, *Moral and Spiritual Values in the Public Schools* (Washington: The Commission, 1951).

⁹ *Chance v. Mississippi State Textbook Board*, 200 So. 706 (1941). This was a suit over the supplying of free nonreligious textbooks to parochial school-children, which was rejected by the State Supreme Court. In 1930 the U.S. Supreme Court had unanimously upheld a suit based on a similar law in Louisiana, declaring that when such textbooks are given to all "the school children and the State alone are the beneficiaries."

government must leave parents free to send their children to schools of their choice. Justice Felix Frankfurter has admitted that "parents who are dissatisfied with the public schools thus carry a double burden," which, he says, raises the problem of "consistency." American judicial opinion has not yet fully faced the corollary to parental freedom to educate according to religious convictions. In the same opinion the Justice raised these questions:

What of the claims for equality of treatment of those parents who, because of religious scruples, cannot send their children to public schools? What of the claim that if the right to send children to privately maintained schools is partly an exercise of religious conviction, to render effective this right it should be accompanied by equality of treatment by the state in supplying free textbooks, free lunch and free transportation to children who go to private schools?¹⁰

General Welfare Benefits

Back of the intransigence of some people to accept even the court-approved general welfare benefits like bus rides and textbooks for parochial school children is the worry that "general welfare" has no limitations other than what the Catholic community feels it can successfully push for. It is not so much today's buses and lunches but tomorrow's salaries, buildings and eventually a fully subsidized parochial school system that rouses non-Catholic opposition. What guarantee is there, they ask, that Catholics will limit their demands on the public purse to the so-called "child welfare benefits?"

On Catholic assumptions this is a loaded question, and the only answer is the frank question: Why should there be any guarantee? Catholics do not look upon the claim to share in general welfare benefits—including education itself—as a raid on the public

¹⁰ *Barnette v. West Virginia* (1943).

treasury but as an issue to be argued in the civic forum because it concerns *civil rights*. The common good of American society may well demand compromises and concessions to tradition on the part of all parties concerned. The nation has been well served by the public schools, yes; but to insist that society must continue to conform to a pattern of public education that no longer fits the social realities is to let the tail wag the puppy. American society gazes fondly into the mirror of its common public schools but the image reflected there is no longer the true one. For the *public* school as presently constituted is one *public* institution that does not reflect American society as it is. We must keep in mind that service to society is the function of all public institutions, including every type of school.

The public schools will continue to exist, and they will continue to be supported by all citizens. But if democracy and freedom of choice are to mean anything at all, the non-public schools must also be kept alive and healthy. Unless their school problem is met, Catholic citizens can hardly be expected to give enthusiastic support to unlimited public subsidies for the state-supported system, the while watching their own schools slowly suffocate through economic anemia.

Obviously there are serious constitutional problems and matters of public policy to be worked out in providing most forms of tax support for children in non-public schools. Again, it should be obvious that the pattern of support for these pupils must differ from that for pupils in the state-supported systems. Yet the entire question must be recognized by all sides for what it is: a grave social issue for whose ultimate resolution all of us bear some responsibility, but one whose complexities do not absolve us from our best efforts to find a fair solution.

(Continued from page 69)

elsewhere in this issue. The official position of the Kennedy administration concerning current proposals is that federal aid to parochial schools is unarguably unconstitutional.

In any case, the above two problems rep-

resent attempts by certain groups to involve themselves in the national debate on federal aid in order to grind different axes. It is hoped that the ax-grinding element will not intrude too far into the debate, and that the federal aid issue can be settled on its own merits.

"Public schools differ from private and parochial schools," observes this specialist, in a "vital respect"; "The cost of public education is borne by all citizens because all citizens govern and control it. . . . No such power exists in respect to private or parochial schools." He opposes federal aid for parochial schools because he believes that if such funds are granted, "It may well mark the beginning of the end of our public school system."

Federal Aid For Private and Parochial Schools? No

BY LEO PFEFFER

General Counsel, American Jewish Congress

FOR THE first time in the century and three quarters of its political existence the United States is faced with a determined effort to make federal funds available to parochial schools. Even if the campaign succeeds, the amount of federal funds that can be obtained for church schools is comparatively small and cannot increase substantially in the near future. In the United States, the main financial responsibility for public education rests with the states and municipalities and the amount of federal aid even to public education will be relatively small. However, should the campaign to open the federal treasury to church schools succeed, it will inevitably be followed by a similar campaign aimed at state and municipal treasuries, with the ultimate goal of making public and church schools equal partners in

the American educational system. This represents the most serious threat to the principle of separation of church and state in the history of our nation.

The struggle for religious liberty and the separation of church and state in America is largely a history of the struggle against compulsory taxation for religious purposes. Because of the great diversity of sects and denominations which even from the early colonial days settled in the various colonies, compulsory adherence to the faith, dogma or worship of an established church existed for comparatively short periods and in scattered areas in America. Long before our Constitution was adopted in 1788 and even before we declared our independence of Britain in 1776, the established churches in Virginia and in New England had given up as futile the effort to proscribe dissenting forms of worship.

But the struggle against use of tax funds for religious purposes continued up to and even beyond the adoption of the Constitution. At the time of the Revolutionary War almost every colony exacted some kind of tax for church support. In New England many dissenting Protestants were jailed for refusing to pay the tax levied to support the established Congregational Church. In the South, Patrick Henry soared to fame and embarked on his brilliant career as a result of his speech in "The Parson's Case," which crystallized the common people's resistance to taxation for church purposes. Perhaps the

Leo Pfeffer is a constitutional lawyer and an authority on religious liberty and the relationship of church and state in the United States. He has appeared as counsel in many important cases involving religious freedom and is a consultant to the American Civil Liberties Union and similar organizations. Among his books are *Creeds in Competition* (1958), *The Liberties of an American* (1956) and *Church, State and Freedom*. He is at present writing a history of the United States Supreme Court.

most dramatic and critical battle took place in Virginia in 1786, the year before our Federal Constitution was written. A bill was introduced in the legislature of that state whose purpose it was to provide tax funds for the teaching of religion. The bill provided that every taxpayer could designate the sect or denomination that would be the beneficiary of his payment. After a bitter struggle the bill was defeated, largely as a result of the efforts of James Madison, the father of our Constitution, and the author of our Bill of Rights.

The major factor in the defeat of the measure was Madison's monumental *Memorial and Remonstrance*, one of the great documents in the history of American freedom. In it, Madison set forth 15 arguments against government support of religion, arguments that are as valid today as they were in 1786. Basically they fall into two classes; those predicated on the concept of voluntariness in matters of conscience, and those predicated on the concept that religion is outside the jurisdiction of political government—the two aspects of what five years later were to become the opening words of the Bill of Rights: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." It is for this reason that the Supreme Court has held that Madison's struggle against the Virginia bill is an important part of the legislative history of the First Amendment.

The defeat of the Virginia bill in 1786 was followed by the enactment of Jefferson's great Virginia Statute Establishing Religious Freedom. This law, too, reflected the dual aspect of what was later to be the religion clause of the First Amendment—voluntariness and separation. The Act forbade the use of tax funds for religious purposes, and prohibited such use even if a taxpayer's money were to be paid exclusively to the religion of his own choice.

When, therefore, shortly after the Virginia statute was enacted, the constitutional delegates met in Philadelphia, so decisive had been the victory of Jefferson and Madison, that no one proposed that the new government should have the power to intervene in religious affairs or to use tax funds for religious purposes. But, as is well known, the people were not satisfied merely with the

omission from the Constitution of any delegation of power to the government to concern itself with religious matters; they insisted upon a specific and express Bill of Rights, and made their ratification of the Constitution conditional upon the promises of the promoters of the Constitution to add a Bill of Rights after adoption of the Constitution.

It is of great significance that in the Bill of Rights which was finally adopted, the very first right named is the right to enjoy the separation of church and state. "Congress," the Bill of Rights opens, "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Public Schools and the First Amendment

Our Constitution and Bill of Rights were adopted before the development of our public school system, and the application of the First Amendment to public education was therefore not clear. But by 1875 our public school system had become firmly established, and the application to it of the principle of separation of church and state was eloquently stated by President Grant in his address that year to the Grand Army of the Tennessee:

Encourage free schools and resolve that not one dollar appropriated for their support shall be appropriated for the support of any sectarian schools. Resolve that neither the state nor the nation, nor both combined, shall support institutions of learning other than those sufficient to afford every child growing up in the land the opportunity of a good common school education, unmixed with sectarian, pagan or atheistical dogmas. Leave the matter of religion to the family altar, the church, and the private school, supported entirely by private contributions. Keep the church and state forever separated.

These words are as relevant today as they were when they were uttered, practically four score and seven years ago. That they reflected the universal feeling of the American people is evidenced by the fact that in the century and three quarters that have passed since our Constitution was adopted, Congress has never enacted a single measure for the support of church schools. It is evidenced further by the fact that although there are 50 state constitutions and 50 state legislatures, each completely independent of the others, in every one of them without exception it is unlawful to grant tax-raise-

funds for the support of church or parochial schools.

What is Religious Liberty?

It is argued by the Catholic Church that the exclusion of parochial schools from a program of federal aid to public schools infringes upon religious liberty. The argument is based on the case of *Pierce v. Society of Sisters* decided by the Supreme Court in 1925. In that case the Court ruled that it would be an infringement upon the liberty of Catholic parents to compel them to send their children to public schools in violation of their conscience. However, the argument proceeds, many Catholic parents cannot afford to pay the tuition required to keep their children in parochial schools in addition to the taxes they pay to maintain the public schools. Hence, unless the government by granting financial aid to the parochial schools makes it economically feasible for the parents to send their children to such schools, the guaranty of religious liberty declared in the *Pierce* case becomes a vain and empty promise. Exercise of religion which is financially prohibitive, it is asserted, cannot be called the free exercise of religion.

I find it difficult to grasp the reasoning behind this argument. If the right of Catholic parents to send their children to parochial rather than public school is a constitutionally-protected exercise of freedom of religion it is so only because the Supreme Court of the United States has so held, since under our system of government the Supreme Court is the final authority on constitutional rights. But the same Supreme Court which held in 1925 that the State of Oregon could not compel parents to send their children exclusively to public schools also held in *Everson v. Board of Education* in 1947, *McCollum v. Board of Education* in 1948, and *Zorach v. Clauson* in 1952, that the government may not finance religious school or religious education. If the latter three decisions are inconsistent with the former, then it would seem that they have overruled it, not only because they are three decisions against one, but because they are later decisions and therefore supersede earlier inconsistent ones.

Of course, the *Pierce* case has not been overruled or superseded and remains today

sound constitutional law. But the reason for this is simply that it is not inconsistent with the *Everson-McCollum-Zorach* principle that the government may not finance church schools. It is one thing to say that religious liberty forbids the government from closing down church schools, as the Oregon legislature sought to do in the *Pierce* case; it is something entirely different to say that religious liberty also requires the government to finance these schools.

In the late 1930's and early 1940's the Supreme Court ruled in a number of cases that the states could not ban distribution of literature by the Jehovah's Witnesses even though the literature violently attacked the Catholic Church and the Catholic religion. The Court held that the Witnesses were exercising their religious liberty. But can it be seriously contended that the Jehovah's Witnesses could demand that the government print its literature—or, to make the analogy even closer, give them money so that they could buy and maintain printing presses because they were not satisfied with government presses?

During the past decade there has been a growing movement to fluoridate the water supply in order to protect the teeth of our children. Many municipalities have engaged in the program. But drinking fluoridated water violates the conscience of Christian Scientists. A number of suits have been brought to stop the program, but all have proved unsuccessful and the Supreme Court has refused to interfere with these decisions. It would undoubtedly be a great expense for Christian Scientists living in communities with a fluoridated water supply to purchase unfluoridated water as required by their consciences. Yet I have not come across a single report of a demand by Christian Scientists that the government give them money so that they can buy such water and thus be economically able to exercise their freedom of religion. I doubt very much that, if such a demand were made, serious consideration would be given to it by the courts.

There is a religious liberty issue in the question of federal aid for parochial schools, but it is one very different from that asserted by the proponents of such aid. I suggest that rather than religious liberty being infringed upon by the exclusion of parochial schools

from federal aid, the reverse is closer to the truth. As I have indicated, the most serious infringement upon religious liberty before our Bill of Rights was adopted was the use of tax-raised funds for religious purposes. In the great Virginia Statute Establishing Religious Freedom it was eloquently stated that "to compel a man to furnish contributions of money for the propagation of opinions which he disbelieves is sinful and tyrannical."

It is, I submit, a violation of the religious liberty of Catholics to compel them to pay for the propagation of the faith of Jehovah's Witnesses; it is no less a violation of the religious liberty of Jehovah's Witnesses to compel them to pay for the propagation of the Catholic faith.

It is also argued that exclusion of parochial schools from a program of federal aid constitutes discrimination against Catholic parents and children.

There was a time in American history when the demand by Catholics for equality and non-discrimination was valid. In many states, particularly east of the Mississippi, the earliest public schools were little more than continuations of existing Protestant church schools. When the general community took over these schools, their Protestant bias and their Protestant practices often continued. For example, in New York in the early 1840's Bishop John Hughes complained bitterly but validly that while the public schools of the city purported to be non-sectarian, they were in effect Protestant in their teaching staffs, textbooks, Bible instruction and in the general atmosphere of the classrooms. About the same time, an eleven year old Catholic boy named Tom Wall was beaten almost to a pulp by his public school teacher because of his refusal to read from the Protestant Bible.

Similar incidents occurred in countless communities; and these were a major factor in inducing the Catholic community in the United States to establish its own school system, where Catholic children would not be discriminated against because of their religion.

All this, however, is past history. Today the public school welcomes the Catholic child as a full and equal companion of all children. No religious doctrines contrary to his faith are taught in the public schools, and

no religious practices unacceptable to him are carried on there. The anti-Catholic bias in the textbooks has long been eliminated, and the entire atmosphere of the public school is such as to assure the Catholic child a feeling and actuality of full equality.

Where, then, is the discrimination? Would it not be more accurate to suggest that here too the converse is more accurate? Public schools are supported by all taxpayers regardless of race or religion and are open to all children regardless of race or religion. But, for the most part, church schools are open only to children of the faith that maintains the schools. Does it not constitute discrimination to tax a Protestant parent to support a Catholic school which his child may not enter, or to tax a Catholic parent to support a Jewish school which is closed to his child? Is not this truly discrimination?

The Congress has recognized the justice and morality of requiring that tax-supported institutions be open to all without discrimination. The Hill-Burton Act expressly provides that federal funds for hospital construction shall be available only to those hospitals which are open to all "without discrimination on account of race, creed or color." The same considerations of justice and morality would require that if federal funds are to be made available to non-public schools, they too must be open to all "without discrimination on account of race, creed or color."

It is obvious that such a requirement is impossible in respect to church schools. It is equally obvious that the granting of federal funds to church schools would constitute an act of discrimination rather than of non-discrimination.

Arguments Favoring Aid

Along with the argument that failure to grant tax-raised funds to parochial schools constitutes an infringement of religious liberty, the most frequent argument asserted in favor of such grants is that to deny them would subject parents of parochial school children to double taxation. According to this argument the parent is taxed to support the public school which, by reason of conscience, his children cannot attend, and then he is taxed again to support the parochial school that his children do attend.

This assertion, however, is itself predicated

upon another fallacy: that the education of a child is a matter which concerns only the parents of that child and that they alone are benefited by the fact that their child is educated. Hence, according to this assumption, they should be free to decide whether to buy the education for their child in a public or a parochial school, and if they decide in favor of the latter, they should not be required to pay for the former any more than any customer may not be required to pay for merchandise at Gimbel's if he decides to buy at Macy's.

This is a fallacy because it ignores the basic premise of America's educational system: that it is the whole community which is benefited when children are educated and that the whole community is concerned not only with the fact of children's education but also with the type of education the children shall receive.

Thomas Jefferson, the architect of so much of our democratic system, first asserted the community's interest in the education of children and the need for free, universal public education. But it was Thaddeus Stevens who, in the debates in the Pennsylvania legislature in 1835, spelled this out fully. To the claim that it was unjust to tax some people to educate other people's children, Stevens replied:

It is for their own benefit, inasmuch as it perpetuates the government and ensures the due administration of the laws under which they live, and by which their lives and property are protected. Why do they not urge the same objection against all other taxes? The industrious, thrifty, rich farmer pays a heavy county tax to support criminal courts, build jails, and pay sheriffs and jail keepers, and yet probably he never has and probably never will have any direct personal use for them. . . . He cheerfully pays the burdensome taxes which are necessarily levied to support and punish convicts, but loudly complains of that which goes to prevent his fellowbeing from becoming a criminal and to obviate the necessity of those humiliating institutions.

To those who conceived of education as exclusively a private obligation, Stevens emphasized the importance of civic intelligence in an elective republic, and the function of the school in educating for citizenship, saying:

If an elective republic is to endure for any great length of time, every elector must have sufficient information, not only to accumulate wealth and take care of his pecuniary concerns, but to direct wisely the legislature, the Ambassadors, and the Executive of the Nation; for some part of all these things, some agency in approving or disapproving of them, falls to every freeman.

It is for these reasons that education in the United States is compulsory, and that a parent is not permitted to decide that he wants no education for his child. For the same reasons public education is universal and free, and its cost is borne by the entire community, even those who have no children at all or whose children attend non-public schools. And it is for the same reasons that control of the public school is in the hands not of the parents alone but of the entire community. School board members are elected by the vote of all citizens of a school district, not only those who have children in the public schools, and those elected to be members of the school board need not be parents of children in the public schools.

It is in this vital respect that public schools differ from private and parochial schools. The cost of public education is borne by all citizens because all citizens govern and control it. If the citizens of a community are dissatisfied with the way their schools are operated it is within their power to vote in a new school board whose policies will more closely reflect the community's will. No such power exists in respect to private or parochial schools. No matter how deep the dissatisfaction of the general community with a non-public school's policies and methods may be, there is nothing the community can do about it. For the public to be taxed to support an institution over which it has no control and in which it is not represented, is truly taxation without representation.

The demand that federal funds be granted to parochial schools represents the most serious assault upon the wall of separation of church and state in the history of our nation. If it succeeds, it may well mark the beginning of the end of our public school system. It most certainly would mark the beginning of the end of the American principle of religious liberty and the separation of church and state as we have known it in the United States.

"...We can assume that we shall need at least \$11 billion more by 1970 for public education. Should we include private school education, there would probably be another \$1 billion or more required by 1970 in addition to present resources." Analyzing the sources of income available, this economist believes that federal and state aid must be increased, and that tuition for higher education must rise also.

Financing Public Education

By SEYMOUR E. HARRIS

Professor of Economics, Harvard University

OVER THE YEARS the costs of education have steadily risen. The rise has been much greater than could be explained by the increase in the price level. In fact, the increase in recent years has been greater than that in the rise of national output. For example, from 1929-1930 to 1958-1959 expenditures on public schools rose from \$2.3 billion to \$14 billion; as a percentage of Gross National Product, from 2.43 to 3.05 per cent. The estimated costs by 1969-1970 are about \$25 billion, or 3.6 per cent of a \$700 billion estimated GNP. This is in fact a modest projection of the expected rise of GNP.

Why do we need \$11 billion more for the financing of public school education? Roughly, 30 per cent is explained by the rise of enrollment; another \$1 billion by additional construction costs required by 1970; more than \$4 billion or almost 40 per cent by the increase of instructional salaries; and I allow also for the increase in gains in the standards of the American people in all walks of life as well as in education. We assume that education will profit as the rest of the economy does, and this explains a further

rise of about \$2.5 billion. Hence for about 45 million students we expect an average cost of about \$565 per capita.

The increase in pay is one important aspect of this problem. Teachers today, in relation to the rest of the working population, have about re-established their pre-war position. This applies only to the public school teachers, not to higher education. School teachers are relatively well organized and there is an interest on the part of the local taxpayer in maintaining the quality of his schools. In the next ten years we do not expect a very large *relative* rise in the pay of school teachers. But since the demand for school teachers is likely to be greater than in other professions an increase in rewards is necessary in order to attract an adequate supply of high quality teachers. Moreover, there has been a tendency toward some deterioration of quality of late.

In an earlier study I discovered in comparing 1900 to 1956 that the excess of expenditures in public school education was about \$10.7 billion. Once we allow for the rise of capital outlays the excess is \$8.4 billion. When we allow for the rise in average daily attendance the excess becomes \$3.2 billion, and when we allow for the excess of teachers' pay adjusted for average daily attendance in 1900, the excess is \$1.4 billion.¹ In other words, the major factors in the increase of expenditures since 1900 have been the rise of capital outlays, increase in the average daily attendance, and the rise of teachers' pay.

Hence we can assume that we shall need

Chairman of the Harvard Department of Economics, Seymour E. Harris has been a member of the faculty since 1922. He is the editor of *The Review of Economics and Statistics* and the author of 25 books on economics, including *Economics of New England*. He has served as a consultant to government agencies many times.

¹ See my *More Resources for Education*, 1960. Harper's, p. 17.

at least \$11 billion more by 1970 for public school education. Should we include private school education, there would probably be another \$1 billion or more required by 1970 in addition to present resources. Should we consider higher education, the total increase of resources would be a rise from about \$4 billion being spent currently to \$10-11 billion by 1970. Of these \$10-11 billion, roughly two-thirds to three-fourths would come out of public resources. The exact amount would depend partly on the pricing system used by public institutions. If they keep their tuition down very much and private tuition continues to rise, then a substantially larger proportion would go to higher education under public auspices than would otherwise be the case.²

Local Financing

Where is the money to come from? In the past the major resources for public school education have come from local government, secondarily from state government; roughly 60 per cent from local government, somewhat less than 40 per cent from state government, and but 2 or 3 per cent from the federal government. But local governments find more and more difficulties in financing their school bill. The major explanation is the rising cost of public school education, together with the peculiar methods of financing local government. On the whole, the educational bill paid by local government comes out of the real estate or general property tax, a tax that responds to rising income very slowly. Indeed, in the last 10 years the response has been better than in earlier years of inflation.

The weakness of the general property tax, especially in an inflation period, is suggested by the fact that whereas in 1940 it provided 35 per cent of all taxes in the nation, by 1957 its contribution was down to 13 per cent. Where some localities have been allowed to supplement their property tax by other kinds of taxes—e.g., sales and income taxes—the record on resources for education is greatly improved. Furthermore, where there has been a tendency to reassess property in response to rising incomes and prices, the results have been better. Over a recent

period of 13 years the assessed valuation has risen as much as 323 per cent in Chicago, and as little as 2, 6 and 9 per cent in Pittsburgh, Boston and Buffalo respectively.

In part the explanation is the rate of growth of the community as well as the lack of flexibility in assessments in some cities. Undoubtedly local governments could make a larger contribution than they now make. Sometimes their debt limits and tax limits are unrealistic, given the current income and property levels in these communities. Moreover, they are sometimes inefficient. For example, failure to consolidate school districts, a means of reducing unit costs, has greatly increased the bill for public school education. I do not, however, believe that even \$1 billion additional could be found from any practical further advances in consolidation of school districts. In the last generation important advances have been made in this field.

There is no doubt that state governments could make a larger contribution. Indeed, their problems of finance are much more serious than the federal government's problems but less serious than local governments'. They have available to them the corporation, income, and various consumption taxes. There are still a great many states that have neither a general sales tax nor a corporation income tax nor a personal income tax. Greater use, particularly of the corporation and personal income taxes, could provide substantially larger sums of money which might be available for helping local governments finance their schools. Nevertheless, in the last 10 or 15 years the increase of debt, of taxes and of expenditures of state and local governments has been at a disconcerting rate. Their financial position has deteriorated much more than that of the federal government.

The serious financial problems of state and local governments, variations in tax capacity of different parts of the country and various states, and the availability for the federal government of the most productive sources of income—all of these point to the need for a greater amount of federal aid for public school education.

It is difficult to see where the additional \$11 billion necessary for public school education, and perhaps as much as \$3 or \$4

² Compare my forthcoming book on *The Economics of Higher Education* to be published by McGraw-Hill this year.

billion additional for public higher education, is to come from if we are to rely solely on local and state governments. Local governments will have to pay a large part of the additional public school bill, and for this reason state governments may have to provide a substantial part of the additional funds needed for higher education.

The Case for Federal Aid

Many are disturbed about the rising level of federal expenditures. It should be pointed out, however, that there was a substantial reduction in the proportion of federal expenditures to gross national product from 1952 to 1961. Moreover, most economists anticipate a rise in the GNP from \$200 to \$300 billion by 1970. Even at current rates of taxes, this would mean that the federal government might well raise about \$30 to \$35 billion more out of tax receipts. It certainly seems possible, therefore, for the federal government to contribute, say, \$1 to \$2 billion additional for public higher education or for higher education generally, and several billion dollars for public school education.

If we can avoid a hot war and we achieve the rise of GNP that we are capable of achieving, I see no reason why the federal government should not provide at least \$5 billion in additional funds per year by 1970 to our educational bill, and possibly even a little more than that. Much will depend upon other competing demands on government, and particularly the need for stopping the decline of our cities. Highways, social security, development of natural resources are all strong claimants for the federal dollar. But if we grow as we should, more funds should be available for these purposes without any need of a tax increase.

The needs may indeed be less than we have so far indicated if our educational institutions would increase their productivity. In a general way education does not match private industry in its capacity to increase productivity and reduce unit costs. Teaching is partly a matter of the relationship between the teacher and the pupil, and the economies of large-scale production are not available in the schools and colleges. This does not, however, mean that many important advances cannot be made. For example, it is silly for teachers who are paid \$6,000 or

\$7,000 a year to carry on functions that can just as well be diverted to assistants at a few thousand dollars a year. It is also silly for a college professor being paid \$15,000 or \$20,000 a year to carry on secretarial and research tasks that can just as well be carried by those who earn just a few thousand dollars a year. The average college teacher in this country gets about \$6 an hour per hour of work, and where the task can be done at \$2 an hour it is wasteful to demand of the teacher fulfillment of these less demanding tasks.

Particularly in higher education large economies are possible. We have too many small courses that are not justified by the educational gains; we have too many courses generally, as is indicated by all kinds of studies of the trend of the curriculum; and we have inadequate use of our plant. We should operate on a 44-hour basis, and not merely on Monday, Wednesday and Friday with the instructor present two hours each morning, and we should operate our plant at least ten months of the year, if not twelve. Such economies might very well result in a saving of as much as \$1 billion a year in higher education.

In the public schools any attempt to get federal revenue, as is already evident, runs into serious problems. What of the private schools? Here constitutional questions arise which will not be solved until the Supreme Court makes the crucial decisions. At present it does seem as though aid to private schools is unconstitutional. Another issue that causes difficulties is the problem of integration. Once the problem of federal aid is tied to the integration issue and help is denied to schools that refuse to integrate, then the possibility of getting federal aid is greatly reduced. Southern legislators who are very influential in the Congress beyond their numbers are not disposed to accept federal aid if this means increased pressure to integrate. These are separate issues and should be treated separately. Once those who are against any federal activity and who are excessively fearful of federal intervention, as well as those who are opposed to aid if it is not made available to private schools, and also those who refuse to support aid because of the fear of pressure on integration—once all these groups unite, it is indeed difficult to

achieve a federal program for helping the schools.

In higher education the problems are also serious. Increasingly students tend to favor public as against private institutions, in part because public institutions charge fees of about one-quarter of those of private institutions. A student who can live at home and go to a public institution has a great financial advantage over the student who goes to a private institution away from home. Increasingly the colleges of the country are meeting this problem by establishing institutions or branches near where the students live. Increasingly it is likely that despite our rising standard of living, higher education will be conducted within commuting distance of most students. There are some states now where there are very few students left who are not within commuting distance of a college.

In higher education one of the crucial issues is: to what extent should the funds to finance the colleges come from public and to what extent from private sources? When one considers that the total bill is likely to rise from \$4 to \$10-\$11 billion by 1970 it is quite clear that all sources have to be exploited as much as possible. In view of the heavy demands on state government for public lower education, and in view of the steadily increasing debt and expenditures of about \$3 billion per year for state and local government, it is quite clear that any sources other than public should be tapped if possible. The major conflict and dispute arise on the issue of whether higher tuition should be charged. There are some, for example Professor Commager in *The New York Times* recently, who argue that education should be financed by government, not only through the twelfth year, but through the sixteenth year. The argument is that higher education is a public service and the social gains are so large that government has a responsibility to assure all students worthy of the effort the means of going to college. The time may very well come when we can afford and when the nation and the taxpayers will be prepared to pay the bill for all those who want to go to college and who meet minimum standards. I do not believe that this time has as yet arrived.

I have estimated that it is possible to in-

crease the tuition income in higher education from roughly \$1 billion today to \$4 billion by 1970. Roughly \$1 billion additional would come from rising enrollment and the other \$2 billion from rising fees. Should this rise of fees be accompanied by an adequate scholarship and loan program then the effect may not be undemocratic. In other words, all those who are able would pay the full bill, and those who cannot and who meet minimum standards would be subsidized by scholarships and loans. It seems a mistaken policy to allow a student, say from a family with an income of \$15,000, to be subsidized to the extent of \$1,000 by taxpayers who are generally of poorer economic status than the student who profits from these subsidies.

Yet many have great concern about any substantial rise in tuition in the public institutions. The image that most have of public institutions is that these institutions provide free education for those from low income groups and once tuition fees are raised, say to \$500 or \$1,000 or \$1,500 as they are in private institutions, then this will be enough to frighten many from going to college. Undoubtedly there is much substance in this position. We should try as hard as we can to get additional resources from government to finance higher education. Social gains are indeed important. But it is still true that where incomes are large and the private gains of higher education are substantial, something is to be said for the individual and his parents' paying at least part of the bill, commensurate with economic capacity.

I have often argued that the appropriate policy would be, for example, to provide not only low tuition, but actually large scholarships for able but impecunious youngsters in public institutions. Why not, for example, raise \$2 billion more from tuition as a result of rising fees and use at least one-half in increased scholarships? Then those who are short of funds and have ability will get the help they need, and the others will pay according to their ability. The administrators of public institutions tell me that this would be a very difficult program to administer, and undoubtedly there is some truth in this charge. Also there is some danger that if the additional tuition money is made available, the taxpayers and their representatives

will insist that the savings not be used for scholarships or to improve salaries of faculty, but rather to cut down the contribution of the taxpayer. In a study of this problem over a great many institutions of higher learning I have found that there is some truth in this charge. There are places where if money is saved through higher tuition the funds are made available for use by the institutions. In many instances, however, the pressure is to use these savings to cut down the burden on the taxpayer.

Undoubtedly if the federal government would contribute, say, \$2 billion to higher education, and if we could get some increase in private gifts that might yield another \$1 billion additional per year by 1970, and the state government would increase its contribution by, say, \$1-\$2 billion a year, then it might be possible to restrict the increase of tuition in public institutions to less than the rise of per capita income by 1970, and certainly the rise from 1940 to 1970 would be much less than the rise of per capita income since 1940. In other words, since 1940 higher education has become a bargain because the increase in tuition has been roughly only about one-half as great as the increase of per capita income, the best index of the ability to pay.

Credit Financing

I would also like to see a much greater use made of the system of credit financing. This type of financing is especially desirable because it enables the educational institutions to compete with others for the credit facilities of the nation, and those who get the credit facilities also obtain the expansion of resources. I have estimated that a student might very well borrow \$1,000 a year over his undergraduate years and yet have to pay over a period of about 40 years only about one per cent of his lifetime income in order to repay this debt. In this manner many who otherwise would not be able to go to college would thus be able to finance higher education. Many indeed object to the use of credit facilities in order to finance higher education. Even those who are prepared to

use credit facilities for financing homes, television sets, automobiles, and the like, shudder at the thought of mortgaging their children's future. There is a feeling that the parents' responsibility is one of educating the child, and that this responsibility should not be taken away from the parent. I am myself not very impressed by this argument. I believe that in the future loan financing is going to play a much larger part in the financing of higher education.

In short, we should not try too hard to keep tuition down, but we should avoid any large rise of tuition. This might be a serious deterrent to students seeking higher education who would profit greatly thereby. The gains are both social and private, and for that reason both society and the individual should share. Indeed, there are serious differences of opinion as to exactly what this means. It is clear that public institutions are strongly determined to keep tuition down as much as possible. But under the pressure of rising costs and the opposition of the taxpayers and their representatives, it is likely that tuition will increase gradually. Even in the last four years, despite strong opposition, tuition of both public and private institutions has risen by roughly about one-third. Such continued increases over a period of ten years would roughly double the tuition. I am hopeful that such large rises will not be necessary and that, with larger contributions, especially by the federal government and secondarily by state governments, and to some extent through private sources, we can keep the rise of tuition over a period of ten years down to about 50 per cent. Such increases combined with an adequate scholarship and loan program should very well make possible adequate financing of higher education and a high quality of education.

In summary the financial problems of education are serious. But the resources are available to provide the means for educating a substantially larger proportion of the population at a higher standard than is current; and this can be done without serious rises in taxes for all levels of education and in fees for higher education.

The U.S. would have spent nearly 2.5 billion dollars more on education in 1950 if all our schools had been brought to what are considered minimum standards.—From a report of the Twentieth Century Fund.

"There is much evidence to show differences in the quality of educational offerings and the effectiveness of schools among communities," notes this specialist, who warns that nonetheless "When larger areas such as states and regions are considered the evidence of differences is not plentiful and is contradictory." Have regional differences sparked the demand for federal aid?

Regional Problems in American Education

By AUSTIN D. SWANSON

Research Associate, Teachers College, Columbia University

PROVIDING for the educational needs of its citizens is one of the few governmental functions remaining primarily with local authorities. Most other functions have succumbed to centripetal forces and have moved from local responsibility to either state or federal responsibility.

Despite local control of the schools, observers of the national scene have often marveled at the similarities among school systems. The differences are indeed subtle.

With the recognition that the nation's primary defense power in the cold war and the nation's general economic and social welfare are dependent upon the skills and talents of its citizens, more concern has been shown for the agencies responsible for discovering and developing these talents and skills—the

schools. There is a realization that we cannot afford to waste any of our human resources because of race or creed or social and economic conditions.

With this concern has developed a mistrust of the thousands of local governments (school boards) charged with the task of educating the nation's children. Questions have been asked. Are they capable of operating the kind of schools necessary to meet the needs of our times? Do they need coordination? Is there equal opportunity?

The purpose of this paper is to look at regional statistics on educational quality, educational provisions and the economic factors involved to see if there is any justification for the mistrust and to discover just what regional problems there are.

First, indicators of school quality will be examined by regions. Then factors concerning the ability to finance an adequate educational program will be examined along with the degree of willingness of the regions to do so. Regional variations in revenue and spending policies will be looked at for evidence of unwholesome conditions. Finally the national situation will be surveyed.

There is much evidence to show differences in the quality of educational offerings and the effectiveness of schools among communities. When larger areas such as states and regions are considered the evidence of differences is contradictory.

One criterion of quality is the speed with which school systems adopt new educational practices of accepted value. This criterion is popularly called "adaptability." Walter

Austin D. Swanson teaches mathematics and science at Ramapo Central School District Number One, in Suffern, New York. He has served as a consultant to the New York State Education Board Study, in 1959, and to the Delaware Survey of Fiscal Policy, in 1960, and is now Executive Secretary of Central School Study, an affiliate of the Institute of Administrative Research and a Committee of the New York State School Boards Association. Some of his projects have been published by the Institute of Administrative Research and as special reports of the Central School Study.

TABLE I: VARIOUS CRITERIA OF SCHOOL SYSTEM QUALITY FOR NINE REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

Region	Column 1 Percentage Selective Service Rejectees ^a	Column 2 Percentage ADA of Enrollment ^b	Column 3 Percentage High School Graduates of the 8th Grade Class ^c	Column 4 Percentage Ele- mentary Teachers Four or More Years of Training ^d
New England	10.3	90.1	63.6	54.5
Middle Atlantic	15.6	88.3	67.8	77.3
Great Lakes	11.2	89.5	74.5	69.3
Plain States	6.1	89.4	71.9	37.4
South Atlantic	34.2	88.1	55.9	81.5
South Central	37.5	87.8	47.8	66.2
Southwest	24.9	87.8	56.4	89.7
Rocky Mountains	5.6	89.4	66.8	68.6
West Coast	11.5	87.5	67.5	84.5
United States	18.9	89.0	64.7	75.3

^a Adapted from Percent of Selective Service Registrants Disqualified by the Mental Test, Including Those Who Failed the Physical as Well as the Mental Test, 1957 appearing in U.S. Dept. of the Army, Office of the Surgeon General, "Processing of Selective Service Registrants, 1957." *Health of the Army* 13:2-13; January 1958, Table C.

^b Adapted from Average Daily Attendance as a Percent of the Number of Pupils Enrolled, 1955-1956 appearing in Schloss, Samuel, and Hobson, Carol Jay. *Statistical Summary of State School Systems, 1955-56*, Circular No. 543, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1958, Table 1.

^c Adapted from High School Graduates in 1955-1956 as a Percent of Eighth-Grade Enrollment in 1951-1952 appearing in Schloss and Hobson, *ibid.*

^d Adapted from Percent of Elementary-School Teachers with Four or More Years of College Preparation, 1958-1959 appearing in National Education Association, Research Division, *Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools, 1959*, Research Report 1959-R6, Washington, D.C.: the Association, April 1959, Table 10.

Cocking¹ used such a criterion in a study conducted in 1951 and concluded there were no statistically significant differences.

Thomas Barrington² came to the opposite conclusion when, using a similar criterion, he looked at publicly supported teacher colleges and their demonstration schools. He found significant differences in the regional rates of adaptation with the Western reaches of the country in the lead, the Northeast in the rear and the Southeast about average.

The most comprehensive nation-wide study with adaptability as a criterion was made by S. David Adler³ in 1955, using data from about 150 member systems of the Associated Public School Systems, a national school study council. While he found wide variations among communities, he concluded that regional differences are insignificant.

¹ Walter Cocking, *The Regional Introduction of Educational Practices in Urban School Systems of the United States*, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

² Thomas M. Barrington, *The Introduction of Selected Educational Practices into Teachers Colleges and Their Laboratory Schools*, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1953.

³ S. David Adler, "An Analysis of Quality in the Associated Public School Systems through the Study of the Patterns of Diffusion of Selected Educational Practices," New York: Unpublished Ed.D. Project, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.

In using a quality criterion of adaptability one is actually looking at the educational process. It is also possible to use the educational product—or the student as the criterion. This latter approach is fraught with deceptions, however, since it is virtually impossible to separate the school's contribution to its pupils from the contribution of the general environment. This is not a problem when using a process criterion of adaptability. The difficulty of a product criterion is illustrated by Table I, Column 1 showing the percentage of selective service rejectees for mental and physical reasons in nine regions of the United States. The Rocky Mountain and Plain States have the lowest percentages of rejections while the South Central and South Atlantic regions have the highest. Certainly the schools affect this measure, but it is also influenced by the general economic conditions of the region as well as other general environmental conditions to the point where one would not say on the basis of this evidence that the best school systems are in the Rocky Mountain and Plain States and the poorest are in the South.

As the results of national examinations

such as the College Board Examinations and the National Merit Scholarships are studied, more insight will be gained into the relative effectiveness of regions in the imparting of factual information to college-bound students. Such a criterion has the same difficulty as the selective service rejectees although to a lesser degree. These tests measure only one function of the schools and not necessarily the most important one. Even in this day of scientific technology, the college-bound students are in the minority and any criterion looking only at an aspect of the success of this group is certainly inadequate to judge the quality of systems. As our knowledge of the measurement of human capabilities improves it may be possible to evaluate the quality of a school system by its product. At the present time it is possible to judge only portions of a system's effectiveness in this manner.

The quality of a public school system's offerings should also be judged by the extent to which its educational program is available to and accepted by its population. Column 2 of Table I shows that the regions are rather consistent in the percentage of the enrollment which attends school daily; however Column 3 shows that there is considerable difference in regional holding power (the degree to which pupils remain in school to graduation). In the South Central States only 47.8 per cent of the 1951-1952 eighth grade class eventually graduated in 1955-1956 while this percentage was 74.5 for the states bordering the Great Lakes. Certainly the Great Lakes region has been considerably more effective in extending educational benefits.

Another criterion of educational quality is the quality of the people who conduct the educational program—the teachers. The quality of a school system is determined primarily by the quality of its professional personnel.

In a study carried on in 1955 in the Associated Public School Systems by Alvin Lierheimer⁴ there was some evidence to the effect that better teaching staffs were found on the West Coast and the poorest were found in the Northeast and Southeast sections. These statistics were not subjected to tests of significance.

⁴ Alvin P. Lierheimer, "Characteristics of Elementary School Staffs in One Hundred Communities," New York: Unpublished Ed.D. Project, Teachers College, Columbia U., 1955.

The amount of training beyond high school is generally considered as a good indicator of professional competence. This is recognized in general practice by tying salaries to the length of professional training and is also substantiated by a considerable number of research studies. Column 4 of Table I shows the percentage of elementary teachers with four or more years of training for nine regions. The differences are striking. Only 37.4 per cent of the elementary teachers have four or more years of training in the Plain States while in the Southwest 89.7 per cent of the teachers have this much training. In the South Atlantic States with salaries among the lowest in the nation 81.5 per cent of the teachers have this training.

Looking at Table I as a whole, one sees a picture with many interesting disparities. The Plain States with one of the lowest rates of selective service rejections and with one of the highest rates of holding power has the lowest percentage of elementary teachers with what is generally considered a minimum amount of professional training. On the other hand, the South Atlantic region with one of the highest percentages of adequately trained (in terms of length of training) teachers has one of the lowest rates of holding power and one of the highest rates of selective service rejections.

At this point there is little evidence as to regional differences in the quality of educational offerings by the public schools, but there is considerable evidence of regional differences in the availability of the public school offerings to children of school age.

The question now arises as to the cause of regional differences in the general availability of education. Is it a situation foisted upon a region because of lack of economic ability to provide an adequate education for all school age children, or is it because of differing societal expectations?

One of the best single indices of ability to finance any expanded governmental undertaking is disposable personal income per capita (personal income after taxes). The federal government uses a similar figure, personal income per capita, in distributing federal assistance funds on an equalized basis. Column 1 of Table II shows that there is considerable range in disposable personal income per capita by region. The Middle

TABLE II: VARIOUS ECONOMIC CRITERIA EFFECTING REGIONAL ABILITY AND EFFORT TO SUPPORT EDUCATION

Region	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4	Column 5
	Per-Capita Disposable Personal Income 1959 ^a	Median Beginning Scheduled Teachers Salaries with BA Degree 1958-59 ^b	Rates of Beginning Teachers Salaries to Disposable Personal Income Per Capita	School Management Effort Measure ^c	Davis Index of Tax Burden ^d
New England	1,990	3,600	1.81	.125	1.04
Middle Atlantic	2,013	4,000	1.99	.155	1.01
Great Lakes	1,894	4,100	2.16	.134	.97
Plain States	1,664	3,900	2.34	.137	.99
South Atlantic	1,357	3,200	2.36	.109	.94
South Central	1,227	3,100	2.53	.116	.93
South West	1,512	4,000	2.65	.126	1.02
Rocky Mountains	1,656	4,000	2.42	.153	1.04
West Coast	1,997	4,100	2.05	.129	1.05
United States	—	—	—	.132	1.00

^a Adapted from *Sales Management*, "Annual Survey of Buying Power," 1960.

^b Adapted from Mort, Paul R., Director, *A Fiscal Survey of the Public School System of Delaware*. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960.

^c See Footnote 6.

^d See Footnote 7.

Atlantic States enjoy the highest disposable personal income per capita with \$2,013 and the South Central States have the lowest with \$1,227. A superficial observation of these statistics would indicate that there is considerable regional difference in the ability to finance education. Such an observation, however, would neglect the considerable regional variation in costs of education.

Recent studies by the Institute of Administrative Research, Teachers College, Columbia University, indicate there are marked regional variations in the cost of education.⁵ This research further indicates that costs for textbooks, supplies, and so forth, show very little variation. Department of Labor figures show that regional variations in the cost of living are slight. The cost to schools for salaries, however, vary considerably. In a service "industry" such as education, the major expense is for salaries—professional, clerical and custodial.

The very measure of ability which is generally used to determine ability, personal income per capita, indicates that, for example,

the Middle Atlantic, New England and West Coast States are in a costly labor market and that the South Central and South Atlantic States are in a cheap labor market. Teachers with similar qualifications will cost much less in the South than they will in the Northeast or the West because the general regional wage level is lower. Most school systems do not buy teachers on the national market.

Column 2 of Table II shows what the median school is paying for an inexperienced teacher with a Bachelor degree in nine regions. The difference between the high and low cost region is \$1,000 per teacher. This disparity grows as experience increases until at the median maximum scheduled salary the regional difference is \$1,600 per teacher. (This latter fact is not shown in Table II.)

Column 3 of Table II shows the ratio of per capita disposable personal income to median beginning teachers salaries. Here we notice that in New England the ratio is less than 2 to 1 while in the South Central States the ratio is 2.5 to 1. This would seem to indicate that although teacher salaries are low in the South Central States relative to teacher salaries paid in the rest of the nation, they are high relative to general salaries paid

⁵ William S. Vincent and Austin D. Swanson, "Regional Variations in Educational Cost and Their Potential Influence Upon Staff Recruitment Policies," *IAR—Research Bulletin*, Vol. 1, No. 3, April 1961.

in the region. The New England States are paying low teacher salaries relative to the rest of the nation. Compared to the general wage level in this region, the salaries are very low. The Middle Atlantic States, while paying high teacher salaries relative to the nation, pay low salaries relative to the general wage level of the region.

Looking back at Table I, Column 4, it is noted that New England has one of the lowest percentages of elementary teachers with four or more years of training. The South Central States do considerably better. The Southwest region with the largest ratio of beginning teachers' salaries to disposable personal income also has the largest percentage of elementary teachers with four or more years of training. This author is ready to hypothesize that this ratio which really indicates how high teachers stand on the socio-economic totem pole is more important in attracting into the profession personnel of quality than is the actual amount of the salary paid. The big exception to this hypothesis is found in the Plain States.

Within a region, better paying school systems are going to attract more highly qualified personnel than the poorer paying ones. There is substantial research to back this statement. Among regions, however, the lure of salary differentials is not so great. If this were not the case, low salary regions would soon have to either raise their salary schedules to be competitive with other regions or lose their good teachers. Neither seems to be happening to any appreciable extent. As a matter of fact, judging from Column 4 of Table I, the lowest paying regions do quite well in attracting to the elementary schools people with an adequate length of training.

It is difficult to say precisely how great the effect of differing educational costs is upon the ability of a region to finance education. Nevertheless, these regional cost differences reduce regional differences in the ability as measured by personal income to finance educational programs of comparable quality. This factor has been ignored in attempts to measure ability and in proposals to equalize

educational opportunities.

Personal income is only one measure of ability. In some respects true property valuation is a better measure when speaking of schools since this is the tax base supporting the bulk of educational costs.

Material wealth is an important aspect of ability; however, material wealth must be accompanied by a desire or willingness by the general public to use a portion of this material wealth for the public schools. Such a willingness is generally called "effort." One measure of effort is the tax rate on full valuation for school purposes which will be treated in the next section. A more general measure of effort is one developed by *School Management* magazine.⁶ It is the ratio of the net current expenditure per pupil unit to the per capita disposable personal income. This measure of effort is reported in Column 4 of Table II. Interestingly the regions with the lowest material ability are putting forward the least effort according to this index while the Middle Atlantic States with the greatest ability are putting forth the greatest effort.

A recently completed study on tax burden by Donald Davis⁷ further shows that when considering all taxes—state, local and federal—the low income states bear less of a tax burden. Comparative regional figures of the Davis index are reported in Column 5 of Table II.

This situation raises a very serious question. Considering the differences in educational costs—could the South, for example, provide educational opportunities comparable to the Middle Atlantic States if the people of the South were willing to put forth as much effort as the people of the Middle Atlantic States?

There is still a long way to go to measure ability justly. While there are differences in the overt measures of ability, these are at least partially offset by differences in educational costs. There is also evidence that the regions generally thought of as being unable to support what is considered an adequate educational program are putting forth less effort both for the support of education and for government in general than are many of the other regions. It would appear that while limited resources may be a problem in these regions, it is not so great a problem as

⁶ "How to Evaluate Your District's Financial Effort," *School Management*, Vol. 5, No. 1, January 1961.

⁷ Donald Eugene Davis, "An Index of Total Tax Burden and The Impact of Federal Tax Severity," New York: Unpublished Ed.D. Project, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961.

is generally believed. A greater problem is lack of willingness to tax themselves more.

Regional Differences in Revenue Policies

To this point the focus has been on rather abstract concepts of quality, ability and effort. The next step is to look at actual regional practice for clues to further regional problems. The eight-point data (following) is based on a nation-wide group of schools:⁸

1. The primary source of local school revenue is the property tax. Thus the amount of true property valuation per pupil unit is important in assessing a region's ability to support an adequate program of education. The Middle States (primarily those around the Great Lakes) are the most able and the Southeastern States are the least able. No adjustments have been made for differing regional costs of education although such would be appropriate. Such an adjustment would increase the Southeast and Southwest abilities and decrease the Northeast, Middle and Far West abilities.

2. Local tax rate on true property valuation is a measure of local vigor or effort to support education. The Northeast is the most vigorous, the Southeast, the least.

3. The Middle and the Northeast raise the most funds locally; the Southeast, the least.

4. In considering state and federal aid combined, federal aid is negligible compared to state aid. Here the Southwestern and the Far Western States contribute the most with the Northeast not too far behind. The Middle States contribute very little. The Southeastern States' contributions approach the national average.

There are also regional differences in the division of educational support between the state and local authorities. The Northeast divides the responsibility relatively evenly. The Middle States rely almost wholly on local revenue and very little upon state assistance. Just the opposite is true for the other three regions. It would appear that if these latter three regions wished to increase educational expenditures, the greatest taxable leeway lies with the local school boards. This is particularly true for the Southeastern region. With the Middle States, however,

appear to lie with the state governments. In the Northeast any increase could be shared by both the state and local school boards.

5. High local effort and high state aid combine to give the Northeast the highest expenditure level. Despite the large amount raised locally in the Middle States, low assistance from the state level throws them well behind the Northeast in expenditure level. The Southeast trails. Cost of education adjustments would be appropriate here.

6. Numerical Staff Adequacy (the number of professional personnel per 1,000 students) is closely related to class size. Here the Northeast and Middle States are in the most favorable position and the Far West and Southeast are in the worst position. Professional experts recommend that between 50 and 60 professionals per 1,000 students are needed for adequate provision.

7. The regional situation in professional salaries has already been analyzed in a previous section. This is the major item influencing differences in regional educational costs with the high income regions paying high professional salaries and the low income regions paying low professional salaries. It is interesting to note that the Far West pays relatively high salaries while maintaining an average expenditure. It does this by cutting back in its numerical staff adequacy.

8. Small Item Expenditures consists primarily of teaching and laboratory supplies, thus corrections for educational cost differences would not be appropriate here. The Northeast has the most plentiful provision for supplies; the Southeast, the least.

From analyzing the expenditure policy of the regions, it could be inferred that the Northeast and the Middle States are providing well-paid teachers in a high labor market in good number with abundant teaching supplies. The Far West is providing well-paid teachers in a high labor market but in short quantity and with an average amount of teaching supplies. The Southwest is providing teachers with near average salaries in a cheap labor market. The quantity is short but better than in the Far West. The teaching supplies are a little on the short side. The Southeast is providing low-paid teachers in a cheap labor market, in very short number, and with fewer supplies.

This approach to analyzing regional edu-

⁸ "Preliminary Report—1960-1961 APSS Finance Study," New York: Monograph, Associated Public School Systems, April 1961.

cation problems has substantiated some previous observations and has added more.

The low wealth states are putting forth the least local effort.

Four regions are placing stronger emphasis on either the state or the local governments for educational support leaving leeway for revenue increases from state or local taxes.

All regions are understaffed according to the experts with only the Northeast region approaching the minimum recommendation of 50 professionals per 1,000 students.

There is wide regional variation in the adequacy of provision of teaching supplies.

The discussion to this point has treated education in a vacuum, divorced from reference to the other demands on government which must also be met and financed from the same tax base. Realistically, in determining the ability of a community, a state or a region to finance education consideration must be given to the amount of total services supplied by the division. In doing so, it will be noted that not only are there regional differences, but differences in community type.

Rural communities tend to have a larger proportion of children to adults than other types of communities. There is also less property valuation and personal income from which financially to support schools. The population is widely scattered meaning that sizeable transportation costs must be encountered or the schools must operate uneconomical units. The school also must provide many services normally provided by governments in larger communities.

Suburban communities are facing the problems of rapid growth. This, accompanied by high educational aspirations in many suburbs, has also created the problem of excessively high tax rates on real estate. At the same time the burgeoning suburbs are increasing their educational facilities, they are also faced with expanding sewers, streets, water distribution facilities, libraries, fire and police protection, and so on.

The large core cities are losing much of their vigor and leadership as the middle class migrates to the suburbs. This class is being replaced by an influx of low socio-economic classes. Buildings, both residential and business, have deteriorated to the point where they must be replaced through urban re-

newal and subsidized housing. Not only does this remove real property from the tax rolls, but it also creates a new (though justified) expense for the city government. Motor vehicle traffic congestion creates a demand for super arterial highways and improved rapid transit facilities. The density of humanity necessitates far greater police protection and court services. The problems multiply, all of which cut into the cities' ability to finance their schools. While in rural areas schools may account for 75 to 80 per cent of local governmental costs, in the large cities schools may account for as little as 25 per cent of municipal costs.

The balance of power in most state legislatures traditionally lies with the rural type communities. As a result, much has been done to compensate for special rural problems. The city problems, by and large, have not received as sympathetic consideration from the state legislatures. This may be the real reason behind current demands for federal aid to education. The rapidly increasing urban populations are more adequately represented in Washington than they are in their own state capitols. When the appeals of cities are ignored by the state legislatures, they then apply to the government in which they have greater influence. This is a dimension of the problem needing further study.

Conclusions

There are regional differences in the quality of educational provisions; however, no region is consistently good or bad on the criteria examined.

There are regional differences in the availability of the educational services provided to children of school age.

There are regional differences in the ability to finance public education; however these differences are not so serious as is popularly believed when adjustment is made for differing regional educational costs.

There are regional differences in the effort made to finance public education.

There are considerable differences in the provision of adequate (in number) teaching staffs and in provision of teaching supplies.

In addition to regional problems of education, there are serious problems according to community type.

"Faced with the hostility of what still seems to be a sizeable majority of their citizens, and a disposition by local officials to flout the Court, most of the states of the "Old South" are still a long way from the partial, let alone total, submission to the hated edict," writes this specialist, who maintains that desegregation will continue; "if for no other reason, it will continue because of the staggering financial waste of maintaining two separate schools systems."

School Desegregation in the South

BY HENRY J. ABRAHAM

Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania

ON MAY 17, 1954, in the now celebrated case of *Brown v. Board of Education*, a unanimous Supreme Court of the United States struck down the "separate but equal" doctrine in race relations expounded in 1896 in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The court had deliberated for almost two years. Delivering the opinion, Mr. Chief Justice Warren first looked to the effect of compulsory segregation itself in public education in the light of the latter's full development and its present place in 17 states and the District of Columbia. He called public education "the very foundation of good citizenship" and "a principal instrument in awakening the child." Continuing with a number of heavily criticized references as to the findings of sociologists and psychologists, he noted that in segregated, separate facilities "a sense of inferiority affects the motivations of a child to

learn." The Chief Justice of the United States then proceeded to pronounce *compulsory segregation* (contrary to general misconceptions he did *not* say anything about "integration") in the public schools to be a violation of the "equal protection of the laws" clause of the Fourteenth Amendment *per se*, concluding:

.... in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal. [Plaintiffs] are, by reason of the segregation complained of, deprived of the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment....

Fully aware of the bombshell-like effect this decision would have upon the South and its long-standing traditions involving the "peculiar institution," as well as of the many very real problems involved in compliance, the Court delayed issuing an enforcement order for one year. It invited interested authorities to submit briefs to it in the interim, embodying enforcement suggestions. This was done only to a limited degree. But on May 31, 1955, the Court ordered the end of compulsory segregation, charging local authorities with responsibility for the cessation of compulsory public school segregation situations under the scrutiny of federal district courts in the home areas of the states involved. It directed these courts to order a "prompt and reasonable start," but clearly left the door open for numerous and specific local administrative problems. However, there was no mistaking its requirement of full and compliance "with all deliberate speed."

Henry J. Abraham has been the recipient of several fellowships and has also received the first \$1,000 award for "Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching," University of Pennsylvania, 1959. He has taught at many universities abroad and in the United States. A member of the advisory board of *Social Education*, he was coach of the University of Pennsylvania Debating Team, 1953-1956. His books include *Courts and Judges: An Introduction to Judicial Process* and *Government as Entrepreneur and Social Servant*.

II

The District of Columbia (Washington, D.C.), under the direct hand of direct federal control, integrated its public schools immediately in the fall of 1954. Otherwise, the response in the affected states has run the gamut from bowing to the inevitable in more or less good faith, through reasonably delayed action, to absolute refusal to obey. Even outright defiance, at one time or another, has occurred in Arkansas, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Louisiana and Mississippi. Many subterfuges have been adopted, led by the-so-far-constitutional "school placement laws." Admission standards under these laws include academic standing, proximity to a school, and whether a pupil's entry might lead to disorder or "psychological unrest." Race is not mentioned. However, officials concede privately, and sometimes even publicly, that the laws are aimed at holding integration to a minimum. In the one Supreme Court test on record, the Alabama Placement Law was upheld "on its face," but the Court noted that it might be applied in a discriminatory, and hence unconstitutional, manner. (It has refused to review the Placement Laws of

North Carolina and Arkansas, but new tests are winding their way through the lower courts as this is being written.)

In some instances, authorities have closed public schools rather than comply. Prince Edward County, Virginia, for example, one of the original litigants in the *Brown* case, closed all of its 21 public schools in September, 1959, rather than bow to the mandate of the federal district court. It had already unsuccessfully appealed the federal District Court order all the way to the Supreme Court. Its system of "private schools," subsequently instituted, has turned out to be little more than a disguise to disobey *Brown* and still segregate. Parents of the white children who now attend these "private schools" are provided grants out of the public treasury to cover all but some \$15.00 a student. For this reason, the United States Department of Justice is attempting to bring the matter before the judiciary once again. St. Helena Parish in Louisiana, under the state's local option law, also voted overwhelmingly (1147 to 57, with only 4 of the county's 4700 Negroes voting) to close its public schools rather than desegregate. The legality of this action is also being contested

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION, 1961

State	Approx. Enrollment		Negroes Attending Classes with Whites		Total School Districts in State	
	White	Negro	No.	Per Cent (approx.)	No.	Desegregated
Alabama	516,000	271,000	0	0	113	0
Arkansas	317,000	105,000	113	.107	419	11
Delaware	67,000	15,000	6,734	49.5	94	23
Dist. of Col.	25,000	97,000	81,392	84.1	1	1
Florida	777,000	202,000	27	.013	67	1 (Miami)
Georgia	682,000	318,000	0	0	198	0
Kentucky	593,000	42,000	16,329	39.0	210	124
Louisiana	422,000	271,000	4	.001	211	1 (New Orleans)
Maryland	450,000	134,000	28,000	21.0	24	23
Mississippi	288,000	279,000	0	0	151	0
Missouri	758,000	84,000	35,000	42.0	1889	200
North Caro.	817,000	302,000	82	.027	174	12
Oklahoma	504,000	41,000	9,822	24.0	1276	191
South Caro.	352,000	258,000	0	0	108	0
Tennessee	671,000	157,000	342	.22	164	8
Texas	1,841,000	289,000	3,500	1.21	1548	131
Virginia	669,000	211,000	208	.1	129	16
West Virg.	417,000	21,000	14,000	67.0	55	43
	10,166,000	3,097,000	195,553		6831	785

in the federal courts. Public feeling has continued to run high indeed over what the whites in the affected states regard as a threat to their way of life, and to the right of the states to govern themselves. Not for many a year has the Supreme Court been under such heavy attack for so long a period by so large and vocal a segment of the population. To cite just one extreme example: in 1957, the state of Georgia passed a solemn "Resolution Requesting Impeachment of Six Members (Warren, Black, Frankfurter, Douglas, Reed, Clark) of the United States Supreme Court"—in a multicolored brochure with the flag of Georgia on its cover.

Nevertheless, a start certainly has been made towards compliance and the consequent eradication of some of the discriminatory practices in the South and the Border States, especially in some of the larger and more cosmopolitan cities. Some 25 per cent of the school districts in the 11 Southern states (Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Tennessee, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas and Mississippi) and 6 Border states (Maryland, Delaware, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma and West Virginia) had been integrated as of the beginning of the spring semester of 1961; but it must be recognized that even *one* Negro admitted to a previously all-white school renders the particular school district "integrated." Slightly more than six per cent of the Negro children eligible now attend desegregated classes.

Yet no matter how grudgingly they may have proceeded, the six *border* states in particular have traveled far along the road towards compliance with the Court's mandate; and a start, however limited, has been made in Tennessee (1956), Texas (1956), Arkansas (1957), North Carolina (1957), Virginia (after lengthy and bitter court battles, 1958), Florida (1959), New Orleans, Lou-

isiana (after physical violence, 1960). Faced with the hostility of what still seems to be a sizeable majority of their citizens, and a disposition by local officials to flout the Court, most of the states of the "Old South" are still a long way from partial, let alone total, submission to the hated edict. Many legal—and perhaps other—battles still lie ahead.

Customs that have stood for generations, that are deeply ingrained in a people's way of life, are not easily altered. Yet when the schools and colleges opened again for the spring semester in 1961, only three of the "hard core" states remained utterly untouched by either public school or public college and university desegregation: South Carolina, Alabama and Mississippi. The University of Georgia bowed to the inevitable by accepting two Negroes early in 1961, and Atlanta was under orders to desegregate its public schools this fall. Moreover, initial court action has now been initiated in both Alabama and South Carolina. Mississippi thus remains (as of this writing, May, 1961) the only Southern state in which segregation in the public schools is still unchallenged in the courts. However, the N.A.A.C.P. plans a "school desegregation effort" in that last bastion "in the fall."

The preceding table (its data compiled largely but not exclusively, from the excellent statistical services of the Southern Education Reporting Service) is designed to illustrate the over-all segregation-integration picture as of the spring semester, 1961. (See p. 95.)

Thus, seven years after *Brown*, less than 200,000 Negro children, or barely more than six per cent, find themselves in integrated situations. Yet, however slowly, progress will continue. If for no other reason, it will continue because of the staggering financial waste of maintaining two separate school systems. Total compliance may not come for many years, but come it will.

"Nobody can travel in tropical Africa without soon being made aware of the importance attached by the African to learning. Ask a hundred literate men what they consider to be the greatest need of their people, and ninety will unhesitatingly reply 'education.' Ask a hundred schoolboys what they want to be and at least one fourth of them are likely to reply, 'Either an education officer or a schoolteacher.' In education the African politician sees the key to better government; the African businessman, the key to greater output and higher consumption; the African welfare worker, the key to happier, healthier living." From the Twentieth Century Fund Study, "Tropical Africa," by George H. T. Kimble.

Discussing the need for more classrooms and equipment in the United States in the immediate future, this educator comments that "a nation that spends more on advertising than it does on education can hardly claim that it is spending too much on school buildings." "During the past quarter of a century the United States has spent only three and one-half per cent of its national product for education."

Physical Plant Problems in Education

BY CHRIS A. DE YOUNG

Professor Emeritus, Illinois State Normal University

ONE OF the most pressing problems in education today is that of providing appropriate and adequate physical facilities for the education of youth. The discussion here is limited to the problems and possible solutions for furnishing functional facilities for elementary and high schools boys and girls in the public schools of the nation. However, this article applies broadly to plant problems present everywhere—at all levels for all learners.

I. Matériel

Schoolhousing requires three major types of matériel: (1) the site or grounds, (2) the structure, that is, the building per se and (3) the equipment, including both the fixtures fastened to the building and the movable items.

The school site—its size, dimensions, char-

acter of the soil, location of the building, and places for play, sports, and parking—is of basic importance. The site conditions not only the development of an adequate recreation program but also possible additions to the existing school plant. In the early days plots of ground unfavorable for other purposes were often selected for schoolhouses. Conditions were so deplorable in 1838 that Horace Mann, a pioneer in education, in his report pleaded with the Massachusetts state board of education for the improvement of school sites and buildings. Much advance has been effected in the last century and a quarter, but many school sites are still a "sight." A school system with a long-term master plan for its building program can save often much money and litigation by purchasing suitable sites or obtaining options for purchase of land well ahead of the date for launching construction.

Most school sites are too small. The modern program of intramural health, physical education and recreation requires a considerable acreage. The National Council of Schoolhouse Construction makes these recommendations for minimum site areas: for elementary schools, 5 acres, plus an additional acre for every 100 pupils of ultimate enrollment; for junior high schools, 20 acres, plus an additional acre for every 100 students of peak enrollment; and for senior high schools, 30 acres, plus an additional acre for every 100 students anticipated. Thus a senior high school of 1,000 students should

Chris A. De Young has spent more than 40 years in educational administration, including seven overseas assignments. He helped design a model rural school for Pakistan, and has taught courses on school buildings and finance in many universities. Presently coordinator of the Grand Valley College, Grand Rapids, Michigan, he is the author of *Budgeting in Public Schools* and *American Education*, which has appeared in its fourth edition in English, plus one in Italian.

have a minimum site of at least 40 acres. Most of our schools in the United States today fall short of these quantitative standards.

Much importance must be placed on the quality of the school site. Appropriate landscaping helps to soften the buildings, to tie them into the grounds visually and to hide some of the ugliness of foundations. Daily contact with a beautiful school site lifts life.

On selected sites school buildings usually follow three major phases of development.

The first step is the preparation of the educational plan, for the building as well as its surrounding site. The general nature of the educational program, and of the building as a whole, is conditioned by the nature of the educational philosophy held by the people of the community, the board of education, the teachers and administrators. Educational objectives should help fashion the form of the physical facilities. The curriculum and cocurriculum activities consist of all the programs under the direction of the school, and help to determine the desired shape and size of the rooms in the building.

The second phase, which is often coordinated with at least part of the first, is the development by the architects and engineers of working drawings and specifications for materials and workmanship. The architect or architectural firm produces blueprints based upon the educational plan mentioned above. He also translates building needs into specifications for construction. He must see as far into the future as the human eye and creative imagination can see, for he plans a building that will outlast him and serve not only the present generation but that yet unborn.

The third major stage is the actual construction of the building according to the architectural plan that grew out of the educational plans. The contractors engage a team of workers, such as excavators, bricklayers, carpenters, metal workers, electricians, plumbers, roofers, *et al* who translate the paper blueprints and building specifications into realities as aesthetic and functional buildings.

School structures can have distinctive personality. The essential basic qualities of a

good school building include: (1) educational adequacy, (2) safety, (3) healthfulness, (4) efficiency, (5) economy, (6) expansibility, (7) contractibility, (8) durability, (9) utility, (10) flexibility, and (11) beauty. There is a great shortage of school buildings that meet all these criteria. Thousands of classrooms are substandard in one or more of these desirable characteristics.

The bare bones of a building must be supplemented with suitable equipment. Unfortunately the high costs of erecting the initial school building militate against the purchase of academically acceptable equipment. No farmer would send his hired help to work in the fields without providing suitable and modern tools and equipment. Many school board members, however, ask their teachers "to make bricks without straw"—to teach without the necessary and modern teaching-learning materials.

Much school building equipment is archaic. Although many teachers drive to school in this year's model automobile, they are in the classroom surrounded with equipment of the Model-T vintage. The quality of school building equipment is as important as the quantity. Much educational equipment today is substandard and/or obsolescent. Obviously the building and educational equipment should meet certain curricular standards. They should harmonize with the philosophy of education, conform to curricular content, fit the functions of the building, and utilize the best research in architectural design and teaching-learning techniques, such as teaching machines, including TV.¹

The richest nation in the world has serious shortages in education. Alvin C. Eurich, director of the Ford Foundation for the Advancement of Education, recently stated in the *Saturday Review*, "During the past decade our deficit of teachers and classrooms has continued at a disgraceful rate for a nation of unparalleled inventiveness and resources." The matériel shortages are epitomized in the need for classrooms.

Figures released by the United States Office of Education on January 1, 1961, indicate that the shortage of classrooms has risen by 6,900 over the autumn of 1959. The beginning of this year (1961) witnessed a total shortage of 142,100 classrooms as follows:

¹ See Charles E. Silberman's article, "The Remaking of American Education," in *Fortune*, April, 1961, pp. 125-130, 194-201.

to relieve overcrowding	66,100 classrooms
to replace unsatisfactory rooms	76,000 classrooms
total current shortage	142,100 classrooms.

The number of classrooms built in 1959-1960 was 69,400 but this was 2,700 less than during 1957-1958. Approximately 69,000 classrooms are under construction or scheduled for completion during the present school year, but the erection of schoolhouses is not keeping pace with the arrival of pupils knocking on the doors for admission. Statistics on shortages in structures reveal only part of the picture.

One way of meeting the shortages in classrooms has been to provide part-time schooling for pupils. This undesirable but often necessary procedure has placed 1,685,000 elementary and secondary pupils on minimized mental diets. This total represents an increase of 100,000 pupils over 1959.

Shortages of structures (and teachers) also affect class size. If class sizes are to be reduced, many more classrooms will be needed. For example, the National Education Association reported in October, 1960, on a research study of class size in large cities. The study states, "to reduce urban elementary-school classes in excess of 25 to that size would require an estimated 92,000 additional classrooms and teachers over the number in service in November, 1959. To reduce the classes in excess of 30 to that size would require more than 28,000 additional classrooms and teachers. To reduce those in excess of 35 to that size calls for more than 5,000 additions."

Geographic differences exist in class size, which obviously affect the need for school buildings. The N.E.A. study just mentioned states that in the largest school districts the classes of more than 25 pupils each include:

97 per cent	Middle Region
94-96 per cent	Northwest, Southeast, Southwest and Far West
84 per cent	Middle Atlantic States

The study concludes, "In all five of the population groups the Southeast condones classes of this size (36-40) most frequently. Also the classes containing more than 40 children are to be found in operation most frequently in the Southeast in five of the six population groups."

The costs of educational facilities also vary in different parts of the country. For example, it costs less to construct schools in areas where wages for workers are lower than in other sections. Furthermore, in the Southern part of the United States less money has to be spent upon heating facilities and fuel. However, throughout the United States school construction costs have mounted markedly and these increased costs must be paid with so-called "fifty-cent dollars."

II. Money

"There is nothing wrong with our public education system that money cannot cure. Why is this true? It is true because adequate funds would make it possible to have small classes in well-equipped buildings. . . ."² Thus spoke Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, one of the nation's most competent lay authorities in education, in her testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee in Washington, D.C. Dr. Harold F. Clark, an economist who has devoted his career to a study of education in relation to the national economy, concludes that "the American people can support their schools adequately if they want to do so. We not only need but can afford a great expansion in the amount spent on education."³ A nation that spends more on advertising than it does on education can hardly claim that it is spending too much on school buildings.

According to the April, 1961, issue of *Fortune*, the personal income in the United States was over the \$400 billion rate per year. The Gross National Product, consisting of materials and services, held at the rate of more than \$500 billion per year. During the past quarter of a century the United States has spent only three and one-half per cent of its national product for education. The nation, with its marked increase in population, has been spending a proportionally smaller per cent of its national income per pupil for education.

² Agnes E. Meyer, "Federal Support and National Survival," *Phi Delta Kappan*, June, 1958, pp. 382-383.

³ Harold F. Clark, "Education and the American Economy in 1960," *N.E.A. Journal*, May, 1955, pp. 293-294.

Supplementing the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar is the increase in the number of students to be educated. The "deficit" in buildings is caused in part by the "surplus" of children. The public school enrollments reached this last year (1960-1961) a new high of 37.2 million, which is an increase of more than one million (3 per cent) over 1959-1960. The number of pupils to be housed in the public elementary schools is more than double that in the secondary institutions. The growth in numbers of students in private and parochial elementary and secondary schools has been great in recent years. This trend is also marked in public and non-public colleges and universities.

The need for educational facilities will vary in the future as in the past. Edward A. Sprague of the long-established F. W. Dodge Corporation states that more emphasis on supporting facilities in education, such as crafts shops, science laboratories, and appliance-filled home economics rooms and the like, will call for more building materials. Sprague looks for a definite shift in emphasis in the school construction market in the years ahead, with secondary and college buildings taking a greater share than elementary.

The 1960-1961 expenditures for school construction are estimated by the United States Office of Education at over \$3 billion. Approximately two-thirds of this construction was financed by the sale of school bonds. However, only 73 per cent of the proposed bond issues for schools were approved. This is less than the bond approvals for health and welfare, water and sewer, and some other municipal purposes. Certainly education is a paramount form of service.

In addition to decreased dollar-size and increased costs, many other factors have contributed to the current shortage of physical facilities for education: earlier marriages, larger families, resultant enrollment increases, mobility of population, reorganization of school districts into larger units with new buildings involved, extensions of educational programs, school construction backlog, and many others. The situation is acute and the crisis may continue to worsen. School housing shortages call for long-term master plans.

The selection and development of sites and

the planning and erection of educational buildings are long-span propositions. Since a new school building usually involves bonded indebtedness, it is necessary to project the estimated cost 10 to 20 years or more into the future. This is not unwarranted, since the building may be used for 50 years or more. A school erected in the 1960's will probably be in use in the twenty-first century. Hence, extensive long-range plans for sites, buildings and their equipment must be developed well in advance of actual needs. This long-period plan is not hard and fast, for it must allow for variables and extraneous factors which cannot always be predicted precisely in advance. Looking far ahead implies that the cost of educational facilities is a continuous appropriation, a fixed charge for the future. Continuous long-term planning entails the techniques of adjusting master-plan forecasts annually or periodically.

Each individual building is a part of the ultimate master plan, which should embrace three essential and integrated phases in an equilateral triangle: (1) the educational plan, (2) the expenditure program and (3) the financing plan for paying for the school structure.

1. School buildings are merely facilitating devices for the instructional process. Functional planning demands, as previously indicated, that the educational philosophy and goals of the schools be translated into an actual workable program for the architect and that his drawings and specifications be checked with it.

2. The expenditure program calls for estimates of the probable cost of the site and building. The bids made by contractors on the proposed new building must sometimes be revised to fit the coat to the cloth. Costs must be carefully calculated.

The erection of new school buildings or the rehabilitation of old structures is usually financed by the community through the pay-as-you-build plan or some means of borrowing. Because the first method calls for the payment of funds out of the current budget, it is used sparingly and only in large cities. The second plan calls for payment out of the funds borrowed through either long-term or short-term bonds or loans. It is recommended that bonds should not exceed a pe

riod longer than 20 years. Usually the erection of a building is preceded by a school election that authorizes the board of education to bond the district. In some Eastern states the funds for school buildings are handled through the city or town budget.

A marked trend is that of paying some of the building costs from the state treasury as part of the minimum foundation program. Typical state grants are: stimulation aids, flat grants, emergency aids, continuing grants, equalization grants, loan funds, and money from state building authorities or commissions.

Several bills in Congress have included provisions for federal aid for the planning and/or construction of local school buildings. Prior to 1961 Congress did allocate funds for the nationwide survey of school facilities and for the construction of school buildings in federally affected areas. The federal government, through the National Education Defense Act of 1958, allocated funds for equipment for such special purposes as science.

Private individuals and agencies are also interested in financing school and college buildings. Many school houses are gifts of groups or individuals. The Ford Foundation in 1958 allocated several million dollars for the establishment of the Educational Facilities Laboratory, an independent, non-profit organization concerned with research and experimentation in school and college facilities.

III. Morale

The abiding influence of environment in the life of a child is appropriately expressed in the following lines from Walt Whitman:

There was a child went forth every day
And the first object he look'd upon, that object
he became,
And that object became a part of him for the
day or a certain part of the day,
Or for many years or stretching cycle of years.

School sites, and the buildings and equipment thereon are or should be morale factors, in the daily life of the growing child. The building should be ultimately fitted to the grounds but formed and fashioned to human needs—practical, psychological, physical and aesthetic. The brick and mortar should be

so fittingly furnished with appropriate equipment that the beauty of the building charms the students who breathe into the architect's creation the breath of life. The school home framed in a natural setting is uplifting and beneficial to all. The wonders of nature upon the school premises, as trees, shrubs, grass and flowers silently unfold their splendors, may initiate a program for beautifying the entire community.

School buildings can be powerful agents in building a good morale not only in the individual pupil but in the community itself. The school building is not an island—it is a community center. It is not merely located in a neighborhood, it is an integral part of the community. In Alaska, the forty-ninth state, schools have long been community centers of economic, social, educational and recreational life for the people, young and old. School plants should be designed not merely for youth but for all learners. The three R's—reading, 'riting and 'rithmetic—must be supplemented by the three L's—life-long-learning.

The first three words of the Constitution of the United States, "we, the people," express the thought and ideal of cooperation. This team concept as a morale builder should permeate the planning, erection, and use of educational buildings in the community, state, and nation.

In conclusion, the story is re-told of the visitor to a stone quarry. He asked the first stonemason he met, "What are you doing?" The laborer replied, "I'm earning twenty dollars a day not including overtime." The visitor asked a second workman, "What are you doing?" This workman, keeping his eyes fastened down on his work, stated, "I am cutting a stone." The question was asked of a third stonemason. Looking up with shoulders back and a gleam in his eye, the workman replied, "I am building a school. This stone on which I am working is to be a part of an educational institution, so necessary for today's children and their children too." The first man thought primarily of money; the second saw mere matériel; but the third had morale—he saw himself as a partner in the team that was building a sorely needed school for a better civilization. Morale makes matériel, money, and methods meaningful in education.

Will federal funds alleviate the teacher shortage? "For many who believe that the great demand for teachers cannot be met because not enough individuals will enter teaching as a profession, the mere increased expenditure of funds is not likely to resolve all the problems of shortages in education."

The Permanent Teacher Shortage

By OTTO KRASH

Associate Professor of Education, Stern College, Yeshiva University

THREE is an infinite variety of clichés and many pseudo-problems in current discussions of American education. Some of these clichés are located in the issues of specialization versus the whole child, quality versus quantity, the average and the exceptional child, local versus federal control, and in such salvation phrases as "critical thinking" and "the basic subjects." This may indicate that all problems are in danger of pollution in the cliché swamp if they are discussed often and persistently enough.

Is the "teacher shortage" a reality, a cliché or a psuedo-problem?

According to a 1947 report from the National Education Association,¹ there were "... 200,000 teachers short of the minimum teaching force needed for . . . elementary and secondary school enrollment." Today, we seem not to be much better off. The National Education Association report on "Teacher Supply and Demand in Public Schools,

1961"² indicates that a shortage of 135,000 teachers in 1960 will continue through 1961 because the shortage is not being overcome by the number of graduates entering the profession.

According to an editorial in *The New Republic*, March 27, 1961, "Our ebullient colleges will be looking for some 25,000 new teachers this spring while only about 5,000 Ph.D.'s are headed for college training." And Dr. Clarence Faust of the Fund for the Advancement of Education has reported that colleges and universities will be short 340,000 teachers by 1970.³

Reports of over-all shortages often confuse individuals who are searching for teaching positions because general statistics do not take specific purposes and values into account. Over-all statistics do not reveal the fact that fully certified teachers have an easier task locating positions in communities which have lower salary scales; competition is keener where wages are highest. Over-all statistics also do not reveal the fact that teachers of mathematics and science are in greatest demand, or that being trained in particular subject matters may entirely exclude the possibility of selecting teaching as a career. There are communities in the United States where there is no teacher shortage of any kind and some subjects are not taught in the curriculum of the public schools.

In other words, the general phrase "teache-

Otto Krash has been president of college chapters of the American Association of University Professors and is the immediate past president of the Middle Atlantic States Philosophy of Education Society. He has taught in the secondary schools of Wisconsin and at New York City Community College, New York University, Hofstra College, the University of Tennessee, Wayne State University, and is currently on leave from Yeshiva. His writings have appeared in *Educational Theory*, the *Saturday Review*, *School and Society* and other journals.

¹ Testimony of Dr. Ralph McDonald, Secretary of the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards of the NEA in *Hearings before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives*, 80th Congress, 1st Sess., on H.R. 140.

² *The New York Times*, April 26, 1961. Also reported in the *New York Herald Tribune*, same date.

³ Television Program, Channel 11, April 26, 1961, 12:30 p.m.

shortage" should be qualified. If we specify a particular class size, if we specify a particular geographical region, if we indicate a specific salary range, if we indicate the "supply and demand" at work in a specific locality, if we indicate a kind of school, subject matter to be taught, and level of training—if we are clear about these qualifications, we can be clear about the specific meanings of the term "shortage."

Federal Aid to Education

For example, let us examine the current debate on federal aid to the public schools. If one accepts the necessity of obtaining such aid, shortages indicated in the statistics compiled by the National Education Association will be readily accepted. If one does not accept the necessity of providing federal aid to the public schools, both the statistics concerning shortages and the motivations of groups seeking such aid may be challenged. Witness the following editorial of the *Brooklyn Tablet*:

The shortage of both teachers and classrooms can easily be created, magnified and propagandized by professional educators and politicians who use education for selfish, personal designs.⁴

The editorial writer refers to a report by Roger A. Freeman questioning the accuracy of statistics that indicate a shortage of teachers, but offers no evidence to support the "selfish" designs of those who gather the statistics. Roger A. Freeman presents an argument against federal aid to education and suggests that teacher shortages are being overcome:

The record shows clearly that school support and number of classrooms and teachers have been climbing more rapidly than enrollment and that many of the shortage reports are exaggerations.

The teacher supply situation also has improved rapidly. The Office of Education revised its annual teacher shortage reports from 72,000 in the fall of 1953 to 195,000 in the fall

of 1959, although in those 6 years the instructional staff in the public schools grew 33.4 per cent, enrollment only 24.6 per cent. The number of pupils per teacher declined. When the reports were sharply criticized, the Office of Education omitted the teacher shortage report from its annual statistical survey in the fall of 1960.

The facts are manifest. The number of pupils per teacher has dropped in the public schools from 36 in 1900 to 29 in 1930 and to 24.4 in 1960-1961. At this rate there may be only 23 to 24 pupils per teacher by 1970.

We may be facing a teacher surplus in the late 1960's.⁵

And again Mr. Freeman stated:

The public schools have been able to increase their teaching staff proportionately faster than the rise in enrollment, and the number of pupils per teacher was gradually reduced from 35.6 in 1900 to 24.4 in 1961.

Current projections indicate that annual school enrollment increases will shrink to half their present size in the 1960's, while the output of new teachers may rise 82 per cent or more. Thus the outlook is for an adequate supply of teachers.⁶

The outlook is for an "adequate" supply of teachers if one is against federal aid to the schools. The outlook is far from adequate to those who desire federal aid to increase the salaries of teachers and attract more individuals into the teaching profession.

If one is against federal aid to the public schools, teacher shortages, even when acknowledged, are not taken seriously. School boards have been found to live within their budgets and have accepted shortages by introducing double class-sessions and by increasing the size of classes. For the most part, state departments of education have met problems of teacher shortages by issuing "emergency" licenses and developing crash programs of intensive teacher training for all candidates who would accept traditionally low wage scales. (It is best to indicate at this point, however, that for the teachers in the public schools, three-fourths of whom are women, many of these so-called *low* salaries are better than women can receive in most other occupations.)

In contrast to the Freeman report of a possible teacher surplus in the late 1960's, President Kennedy's special message on education to the Congress, February 20, 1961,

⁴ Reprinted in the *Congressional Record*, March 7, 1961, p. 594.

⁵ From *Nation's Business*, March 1961; reprinted in the *Congressional Record*, March 9, 1961, pp. 2405-6. Cf. report of Senator Ernest L. Wilkinson, Brigham Young University, to Senator Morton, Chairman, Republican National Committee, *Congressional Record*, February 28, 1961, p. 2618.

⁶ P. 4573, *Congressional Record*, March 27, 1961. Statement before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 87th Congress, 1st Session, March 13, 1961.

stressed continued shortages of teachers and the large numbers of teachers who do not meet certification requirements:

Throughout the 1960's there will be no lack in the quantity of students. An average net gain of nearly 1 million pupils a year during the next 10 years will overburden a school system already obviously strained by well over a half-million pupils in curtailed or half-day sessions, a school system financed largely by a property tax incapable of bearing such an increased load in most communities.

But providing the quality and quantity of teachers and facilities to meet the demand will be a major problem. Even today, there are some 90,000 teachers who fall short of full certification standards. Tens of thousands of others must attempt to cope with classes of unwieldy size because there are insufficient teachers available.

We cannot obtain more and better teachers—and our children should have the best—unless steps are taken to increase teachers' salaries. At present salary levels, the classroom cannot compete in financial rewards with other professional work that requires similar academic background.⁷

Is the expenditure of federal funds a means of alleviating "the teacher shortage"? For many who believe that the great demand for teachers cannot be met because not enough individuals will enter teaching as a profession, the mere increased expenditure of funds is not likely to resolve all the problems of shortages in education:

Between 1950 and 1957, school expenditures have risen 60 per cent and teachers' salaries 50 per cent. Despite this, our 1957 teacher shortage is 50 per cent greater than in 1950 and, although total enrollment is up only 30 per cent, we have 110 per cent more pupils on double shifts. Clearly we are confronted with problems in education that money alone cannot solve.⁸

Qualified Teachers

It is obvious that the question of teacher shortage becomes meaningful when related to specific purposes and values. It is the main purpose of this article to suggest that the question should be related to *qualified* personnel, not merely to numbers. Any sig-

nificant consideration of the problem of shortages would then include such questions as the following: are all certified teachers qualified? What is a qualified teacher? an exceptional teacher? a master teacher? Is there a shortage of *qualified* teachers?

It should be a relatively simple proposition to define the characteristics of a qualified teacher if we are able to describe the function of teaching. What is that function? What does a teacher do? What is the subject matter of teaching? This might also be a simple matter if there were some measure of agreement as to the characteristics of good teaching. But there are innumerable definitions, and virulent disputes about the function of the teacher. Teachers are supposed to be equipped and expert in various fields of subject matter: history, geography, and the like. But what is the subject matter that we may label "teaching"?

Many of these questions will lead to a morass of controversy and mountains of literature—"teaching is an art," "teaching is a science," "a teacher is one who knows his subject matter." But the question of teaching itself as a subject matter has received slight attention. The question is often regarded as naive and dismissed as insignificant by those who believe that "everyone who is an expert in a subject can teach it," or believe that "teaching is an art in which learning is caught not taught."

A theory of qualified teaching has yet to receive any substantial attention from the critics of the schools; and it receives little attention from the professionals in education. Everyone will acknowledge the fact that some teachers are better than others. But whatever the term "merit" may signify, it has not been expressly formulated into substantive criteria without often becoming a tool of patronage misused by the principal or superintendent of schools who actually wield the power in our educational system. Teachers have, therefore, grown wary of the term "merit" and have been successful in obtaining a single salary schedule. In turn, the single salary schedule has prevented the schools from establishing criteria for judging and rewarding the better teacher.

In contrast to the vagueness that surrounds education as a subject matter, there is general agreement on the nature of subject mat-

⁷ *Congressional Record*, February 20, 1961, p. 2244.

⁸ Alvin C. Eurich, *The Nation*, May 10, 1958, p. 174; reprinted in *The Great Debate*, Scott, Hill and Burns, Prentice-Hall, Spectrum Book, N.J., 1959.

ters other than education. While this agreement is not overwhelmingly justified, as evidenced by the many new combinations of subject matters—biochemistry, biophysics—and the lack of clarity about “overlapping” subjects, nevertheless, educators have accepted defined areas of knowledge as curriculum units. Secondary school pupils attend classes in biology, history, physics, literature. Current teacher candidates discover that courses entitled “education” are under attack as methods courses without content, and that these courses are being gradually eliminated for increased numbers of courses in “subject matter.” That teachers colleges submit to this “invasion of the subjects” is due in large measure to the inability of defining any subject matter that can legitimately be called “education.”

One cannot remedy this “gap” in a short article, but specifying the subject matter of “teaching” or “education” is necessary if we are to determine the nature of *qualified* teaching; necessary, if we are to clarify this dimension of the teacher shortage. What are some of the conditions that would establish teaching as a subject matter in its own right?

Teaching—A Subject Matter

Teaching cannot be its own subject matter divorced from the subject matter being taught. But teaching may be thought of as a specialization in the methods by which subject matters have developed throughout the course of history, a specialization in the methods by which knowledge has been obtained. Teaching becomes a way of presenting subject matters in such a fashion that children may learn. That they do not always learn, even present techniques, is commonplace knowledge for anyone who has ever been in charge of a classroom. But this indicates that there are many deficiencies in the disciplines of knowledge that deal with the problems of learning.

The habit of mind that would classify this deficiency in knowledge as a mystery—a mysterious process by which something is *tought* by pupils—misconceives the problem of learning as a characteristic of human nature rather than as a problem of knowledge. If the problems of learning and teaching long in the realm of knowledge, then *the*

way in which men have learned in every subject matter field provides the content for a basic teacher training program and the specialization that is education. While specialization in the methods by which knowledge has developed and increased is not limited to courses labeled “education,” but is also central to the discipline of philosophy, nevertheless these methods are the specific professional obligation of qualified teachers, and the specialized area of knowledge that is “education.”

Teacher trainees must learn these historic methods of inquiry including techniques of change and innovation. It is as an expert in this subject matter that the qualified teacher locates his specialized function. In any event, these are some conditions of the specialization of education that provide means for determining the professional skill demanded of a *qualified* teacher.

To repeat, qualified teaching consists in the ability to present the conditions of specialization in all subject matters in relation to the principles by which the subject matter has been organized. Further obligations for the fully qualified teacher include sharing controversies about these principles of organization with students, and describing the deficiencies in knowledge that present a challenge to students for developing their own creative inquiries. Teaching, thus qualified, would permit students to understand the challenge of acquiring knowledge, and their own role in helping to resolve deficiencies. Knowledge would not merely seem to be the accomplishment of select human genius. In addition, knowledge would become a challenge *because* of its deficiencies.

Children can at the earliest level of inquiry become familiar with the difficulties overcome by past investigators and learn that some problems still resist solution. On the level of the elementary school child, reputedly accurate source materials include columns of errata, and myth-breakers among historians provide innumerable opportunities for direct observation of error. Enabling the child to discover inaccuracy for himself and begin to work on methods for establishing fact would provide qualified teachers with materials for developing a program of *qualified* education.

A qualified teacher presents students with

accurate statements and experiments revealing the areas of ignorance which remain in the most firmly established subject matters. His students are trained in alternative conceptions of value; namely, value as permanent and unchanging, value as process and synthesis, and value as empirically verifiable propositions.

If teachers are able to cope with the problems of accuracy, contemporary ignorance in knowledge and alternative conceptions of value, then the teacher is fully qualified. A teacher thus qualified does not withhold subject matter from analysis. He does not accept regional criteria for evaluating the importance of subject matter, and he does not accept pressure-group standards in selecting and rejecting educational subject matter. The qualified teacher is primarily interested in the students' understanding of the processes of knowing.

The problem of teacher shortages thus takes on additional significance when we determine the specialized function of a fully qualified teacher.

Problems for the Qualified Teacher

If the conditions indicated above were to become the *content* of qualified teaching, our fully qualified teacher would be in for many a rude shock, that could prevent potentially skilled candidates from choosing teaching as a career. How many of the following obstacles prevent candidates from entering the work of education? How many of these obstacles are responsible for maintaining the shortage of fully qualified personnel?

A budding college teacher may find that he is hired on the basis of compatibility and prestige and it is on the basis of these criteria that he maintains his position. On other teaching levels, he will find that he can keep his job provided that he remains subordinate.

Our newly qualified teacher would be prepared to assist his colleagues in achieving the right to determine the subject matters included in the educational program. He would find, however, that teachers on the elementary and secondary school levels do not have that right. He would discover that

his colleagues are treated as non-professionals. Many teach from texts assigned to them, and teach subject matters over which they have little or no control. He would find that the conditions under which his colleagues teach are most often determined by superintendents, principals, local boards of education, state departments of education staffed primarily by administrators, and by legislative decree. He would find that under most circumstances the conditions of teaching are not determined by teachers.

It is commonplace for pressure groups to be responsible for the rejection of school text materials. Classrooms illustrations that refer to *collectives* in China or the Soviet Union, or statistical references to a *welfare state* could easily make a mathematics teacher suspect. Using the license of exaggeration we might easily preempt the school of any subject matter whatsoever. Inasmuch as the labels of subject matter remain in the schools, one may be sincerely nonplussed as to what activities and assertions take place in the name of these labels. A cursory examination of textbooks will aid any interested reader in discovering the absence of controversy.

The teacher's efforts, of necessity directed toward the system of education, would be met with opposition from his administration and with lack of comprehension by his colleagues (most of whom confine their activity to the classroom in which there are no peers to challenge their statements and actions). If he proceeded with his "assistance" before he acquired tenure, he would in all probability be forced to accept good recommendations for some position in another school and in a different school system. If he waited until after he received tenure, he would be classified as "one of those uncooperative people," singled out as a living example of the "freedom that is permitted in our school," or summarily dismissed, despite the tenure theory. Some courts have explicitly stated that those with the right to hire have the right to fire, tenure or no tenure.

Professional Obligations

He would find the National Education Association usually has first claim on his membership because of the influence of the

⁹ Cf. Reports by Dr. Albert Alexander, textbook analyst for the New York City school system, *New York Times*, January 9, 1961; and, *The School Review*, Vol. 68, Number 4, Winter 1960, "Safe Textbooks and Citizenship Education" by Marc M. Krug.

administrators of his school who respond to administrative dominance of the national office. The American Federation of Teachers, A.F.L.-C.I.O. would be frowned upon by many teachers as well as administrators (administrators are excluded from membership) and his membership in this organization would be subject to derogation in most regions of the United States because of its affiliation with organized labor.

He would find that the strength of teacher organizations depends upon the strength exhibited at the local level. But he would find most teachers organizationally indifferent and unsympathetic, confining their activities to the four walls of their classrooms. If he chose unpopular groups with which to associate, he would soon learn the meaning of "guilt by association."

Our newly qualified teacher had best understand that the National Education Association has been unable or unwilling to enforce its code of ethics. What would prompt an administrator-controlled organization to enforce a code of professional ethics upon local administrators at the request of teachers? As one of the largest spenders among lobbyists, the N.E.A. has been unable to achieve its objective of obtaining federal aid for education in 40 or more years of persistent political effort. The American Federation of Teachers has some 55,000 members among the 1,300,000 teachers in the United States, and is likely to be accepted as a proper professional organization in regions where organized labor exercises some degree of political power. The American Association of University Professors has been unable to obtain general legal support for the conception of tenure; and tenure has been disregarded by many administrations and some courts.

Our newly qualified teacher would recognize that he must work to develop organizations of strength and true teacher representation if he ever expects to acquire a profession worthy of the name.

Social Obligations

Our teacher would confront the distorted idea that he represents *all the people* in his service to all children in the public schools. He is not supposed to have any preferences among organizations that represent segments of the population. In short, he must be

apolitical. If he should be selective, however (as a qualified teacher must be), he would immediately be embroiled in partisanship and condemned by those who hold the "whole people" theory. William Heard Kilpatrick, for example, condemned New York City teachers for calling a strike because they were thereby withholding their services from all the children. On the basis of this idea, teachers are expected to have fewer avenues for change in their working conditions than are available to other groups in our society. This has the effect of encouraging teachers to avoid any activity outside the classroom that could affect whatever may go on within it.

If our teacher was significantly interested in acquiring more controls over his own professional activity, he would be willing to risk his job security, his popularity, and also be willing to join minorities among his colleagues who are working persistently toward more adequate professional organization. A politically effective teachers' organization would have power and control over their own working conditions. A strong professional organization would assist qualified teachers in their efforts to develop fully qualified citizens.

The Permanent Shortage

A fully qualified teacher would make strenuous efforts to change an educational system easily characterized as a "womb with a view" (a view determined primarily by American Legion and other pressure group conceptions of "safe" educational techniques). He would try to change this system to one in which there is a critical presentation of *alternative* views. This new educational program would include a description of the deficiencies as well as the significance of pressure group principles. The newly qualified teacher would examine the ignorance in current knowledge and use methods of instruction that would awaken students to their own intellectual potential for reducing that ignorance.

The problem of teacher shortages will become a more significant problem when we attend to the specialized function of qualified teaching. And there will always be a shortage of teachers who are fully qualified in education as a specialized subject matter.

"In the midst of a national debate on the dangers of federal aid and possible interference with the schools of the land," this educator writes, "Hawaii's historical development is of particular pertinence."

Hawaii: Equalization through Centralization

BY HUBERT V. EVERLY

Dean, Teachers College, University of Hawaii

OUR FIFTIETH STATE is the nation's leading exponent of the centralization of educational control. In a nation historically dedicated to decentralization, Hawaii's example is one of sharp contrast. The other 49 states divide about 50 thousand local school districts among them. Hawaii has none. Operating under a single appointive state school board, Hawaii represents the ultimate in the current national trend toward district consolidation. As a nation, we have defended the local school board election as one of the basic elements of a democratic system. Hawaii has never conducted such an election. Unimpressed by the national school systems of other world powers, the United States has clung to localism. Historical accident gave our nation such a system. Equally accidental was the development of Hawaii in the opposite direction. For Hawaii's pattern of school control was evolved under a monarchial system. Preserved by a Congressional Organic Act at the time of annexation, this centralized school system was continued under territorial status. Thus Hawaii has served as a testing ground

for the efficacy of the centralization of educational control for over 100 years.

As a state which exemplifies democratic values in the daily lives of its people, Hawaii is not inclined to take a back seat to any other American community. In war, as in peace, Hawaii's youth have demonstrated beyond all question their devotion to their country. As citizens, they go to the polls in greater proportionate numbers than in any other state. Yet we might expect quite a different result from a populace educated under the educational controls described above. If decentralization of our school systems is so essential to the preservation of our national values, how could Hawaii have developed social institutions so essentially American?

In the midst of a national debate on the dangers of federal aid and possible interference with the schools of the land, Hawaii's historical development is of particular pertinence. For here is a public school system which has spent 60 years developing under a Hawaiian monarchy and another 60 years under the federal supervision inherent in territorial status.

At the time of their discovery in 1778, the Hawaiian Islands were inhabited by approximately 300 thousand native Polynesians. The following century and a half saw this indigenous group decimated and largely replaced by foreign elements. Throughout this period, this invading foreign influence was largely American. A large number of American trading vessels began calling at Hawaiian ports in connection with the fur and sandalwood trades. After the discovery of sperm whales in Japanese waters, in 1819,

Hubert V. Everly is Professor of Education at the University of Hawaii. He has taught in several high schools in Hawaii. From 1941 to 1942 he was a teaching fellow at Ohio State University. He has served as director of secondary education, 1950-1955, and as president of the Hawaiian Education Association.

white traders began to settle in the Islands in significant numbers.

About this time, the first Christian missionaries reached Hawaii, sent out from New England by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Among other contributions, these missionaries brought with them the New England concept of universal education. In order to disseminate their Calvinistic doctrines, common schools were established. Thus Hawaiian public education, like that of continental United States, stems from New England influences. In a relatively short period of time, the missionaries succeeded in securing the confidence of Hawaiian rulers and were able to make their influence widely felt in all aspects of Hawaiian life.

With the diminishing of the whaling industry, the foreign trader group began to search for new sources of revenue. Among other experiments, the first sugar plantation was started in 1836. Several factors were instrumental in the failure of these early experiments: (1) the traders were inexperienced as agriculturists; (2) native Hawaiians were not suitable as plantation laborers; (3) all land was owned by the Hawaiian chiefs; and (4) there was no law in Hawaii other than that provided by the proclamations of Hawaiian kings. These and other factors placed Hawaii in a position of jeopardy. The kingdom was threatened with the loss of its independent status. In alarm, Hawaiian rulers turned to the American missionary group for help and advice.

During the next decade several far-reaching steps were taken: (1) a constitutional monarchy was established in 1840; (2) commissions were sent to the United States and Europe to secure guarantees of continued Hawaiian independence; (3) the great *mahele* (land division) of 1848 made it possible for commoners and foreigners to own land; and (4) foreign advisers (largely American) were imported to help reorganize the structure of government to conform to more acceptable practices.

It was now possible for the foreigners to continue attempts to develop Hawaii agriculturally, and sugar soon became significant as a source of income. There remained, however, three obstacles which prevented complete exploitation of this industry:

(1) an unsatisfactory labor supply, (2) the great cost of transportation to distant markets (United States), and (3) United States tariff walls that reduced profits.

The pattern for solution of the first problem was set by the importation of cheap foreign contract laborers from China and the Gilbert Islands beginning in 1852. During the ensuing 80 years, an estimated 400,000 persons of varied races were imported for this purpose. To meet the problem of distance from their markets Hawaiian industrialists began the organization of shipping companies—the forerunners of today's steamship lines. As early as 1853, annexation to the United States was proposed as a means of evading tariff walls. The failure of this move led to efforts to secure a reciprocity treaty which would permit the entry of sugar into the United States free of duty.

Establishment of Public Schools

The government reorganization of the 1840's provided the impetus for significant developments in education. The first school laws setting up a system of public education were enacted in 1840. These laws were permissive in character, reading much like the Massachusetts laws of 1637-1642. The system provided for community district schools under the supervision of a "school agent" for each island. These were to be coordinated by a *luna* or superintendent. A native Hawaiian, David Malo, became Hawaii's first superintendent of public schools.

Two factors prompted the New England missionaries to turn over to the kingdom the control of the schools they had promoted: (1) the American depression of 1837 had cut off the financial support of the Hawaiian Mission, and (2) Catholicism was spreading rapidly in the Islands and a competing Catholic school system was developing. The Protestant group controlling the government felt that they could continue their control of common education at public expense and thus prevent the Catholics from extending their influence. The school laws, however, made inadequate provisions for the financial support of the public schools. Direct taxation for schools was therefore attempted. The Catholic group very shrewdly then offered schooling free of charge. The obvious result was the opposite of that anticipated by

the Protestant group, and the Catholic schools grew at the expense of the public schools.

The organic acts of 1845-1846 (as differentiated from the Organic Act of Congress of 1900) created a department of public instruction, as one of five departments of government. Over each department was a Minister to the Crown. This is the origin of Hawaii's present unique centralization of educational control. The obvious effect of this reorganization was to enable the public schools to be supported directly from the government treasury. The first Minister of Public Instruction, William Richards, died soon after taking office and Richard Armstrong became the man to whom credit must be given for establishing firmly the American foundation and character of Hawaiian public education.

During the next decade he instituted innovations which suggest the influence of his friend and contemporary, Horace Mann. Among the achievements credited to Armstrong are: (1) developing a kingdomwide system of education, (2) placing the system on a fiscal basis, supported out of legislative appropriations—a typically American practice, (3) giving emphasis to vocational and coeducational curriculum practices, (4) initiating the non-sectarian concept through legislation abolishing sectarianism in publicly supported schools, and (5) introducing English as a medium of instruction. This last innovation had been long opposed by the missionary leaders, who feared that a knowledge of English would bring Hawaiians into the contaminating influence of the whites in port areas. The vocational demands of Hawaiian youth who were entering the industrial enterprises of the Caucasians were not to be denied, however, and eventually English became the universal language of the public schools. Perhaps no other country has permitted a cultural invasion to the extent of supporting a system of public schools conducted in a foreign language.

Continued opposition to missionary influence by the industrialists caused the abolition of the ministry of education in 1855. A board of education, with Armstrong as president, continued to administer public education effectively, however. Armstrong's death, in 1860, left Hawaii without professional

education leadership. Kekuanaoa, the father of King Kamehameha V, became president of the board of education. Since he knew no English and was unfamiliar with educational practices, he was responsible for the rapid deterioration of public education. In 1865 a third reorganization of education was undertaken, this time supported by the recently organized Anglican Church. This church was established in 1862 and royalty had accepted its leadership in preference to that of the New England missionaries. Two Hawaiian princes, who later became King Kamehameha IV and King Kamehameha V, made a tour of the world during this period. In England they were welcomed as visiting royalty and feted lavishly. The experience made a lasting impression on the two monarchs and their subsequent British sympathies enabled the Anglican Church in Hawaii to become influential.

Under provisions of the new setup the board of education was increased to five members with the provision that it was to employ professional leadership under the title "Inspector General of Schools." Although the first Inspector General, Abraham Forannder, was opposed to American practices and influence, he was operating a structure typically American—a school board operating through a superintendent hired by the board. From 1865 until the overthrow of the monarchy, the Anglicans retained their influence over royalty but not over education. All subsequent Inspectors General were American educators and the trend toward Americanization continued unabated.

With the adoption by royalty of the Anglicans and the abolition of the Hawaiian Mission in 1863, the political influence of the New England missionary group was at an end. It was soon revived, however, by the sons of the early American missionaries who were by this time the leading industrialists. The attention of this group was largely directed toward the development of the sugar industry. They organized the various independent plantations around five "factors" who marketed their plantation products and supplied in return the equipment and supplies needed. By the time of the overthrow of the monarchy in 1893, virtually all of the agricultural industry was conducted on a corporation basis. Efforts to gain a free en-

try of sugar into the United States were renewed, culminating in the Reciprocity Treaty of 1875. The sugar industry soon became very profitable.

The two groups then most influential in Hawaii, Hawaiian royalty, supported by the Anglican Church, and the new industrialists, continued their under-cover struggle for dominance until the reign of Queen Liliuokalani. A very strong-minded woman, she demanded and received almost absolute powers from the Hawaiian legislature. The American industrialists, rather than face the loss of their position, in 1893 forced the Queen to abdicate and immediately sought annexation to the United States unsuccessfully. Thus, the Republic of Hawaii was established in 1894.

During this interim, educational practices continued to become more American as one aspect of a picture intended to establish Hawaii's contention that she was an American community and deserving of annexation. As evidence of this trend the following steps can be noted: (1) education was made free by the abolition of tuition fees; (2) the English language as a medium of instruction was made compulsory; (3) public subsidies to private schools were abolished; (4) secondary education was established under public control with the opening of Honolulu High School (now McKinley High School); (5) publicly supported and controlled teacher training was inaugurated with the establishment of the Honolulu Normal and Training School (now College of Education, University of Hawaii); and (6) Hawaiian education came under the influence of the early "Progressive" movement in education.

The Spanish-American War caused the United States to take a renewed interest in Hawaii. American possession of Pearl Harbor, as provided for in the Reciprocity Treaty renewal of 1887, made possible the prosecution of the war against Spain in the Philippines. The issue of annexation again became acute. Hawaii was speedily absorbed, by joint resolution of Congress, instead of by treaty as earlier proposed. Annexation brought about the passage by Congress of the Organic Act of Hawaii, in 1900, granting territorial status. Hawaii's educational structure, already thoroughly American in character, was untouched by the Organic Act.

Since annexation, the trend in public education in Hawaii has continued to be American in theory and practice. Structurally different by virtue of its centralization of control, in other aspects Hawaiian education conforms generally with practice in the rest of the United States. Examples of these aspects are: federal aid, use of American texts, American trained teachers, courses of study based on American practices, a salary schedule influenced by mainland schedules, a building program influenced by American standards and an underlying educational philosophy influenced by Americans.

Statehood and Change

The achievement of statehood brought into effect a state constitution which had been drawn up by an elected convention some ten years previously. The essential provisions for educational control were little changed. However, the alterations adopted a decade ago have given rise to fierce battles.

Article IX—Education

Section 1. The State shall provide for the establishment, support and control of a state-wide system of public schools free from sectarian control, a state university, public libraries and such other educational institutions as may be deemed desirable, including physical facilities therefor. There shall be no segregation in public educational institutions because of race, religion or ancestry; nor shall public funds be appropriated for the support or benefit of any sectarian or private educational institution.

Section 2. There shall be a board of education, the members of which shall be nominated and, by and with the advice and consent of the senate, appointed by the governor from panels submitted by local school advisory councils to be established by law. At least part of the membership of the board shall represent geographic subdivisions of the State.

Section 3. The board of education shall have power, in accordance with law, to formulate policy, and to exercise control over the public school system through its executive officer, the superintendent of public instruction, who shall be appointed by the board and shall be *ex officio* a voting member thereof.

Imbedded in these three sections are the provisions for (1) the establishment of "local school advisory councils" and (2) the appointment of the state superintendent by his own board. The second change, in effect,

removes the superintendent from the governor's appointive cabinet and thus, hopefully, from politics. It is the first of these changes which has become a partisan issue. The Democratic party is dedicated to the idea that this state board should be elected, rather than appointed. The Republican party insists that the existing provisions of the Constitution of Hawaii be implemented. With each party in control of one of the two houses of the state legislature, no action has been taken to "establish by law" the local school advisory councils. Thus the role which such councils might play in bringing about increasing local participation in the affairs of the schools is not known at this juncture.

However, neither of the combatants at issue favor any marked decentralization. With the fiscal powers held securely by the state legislature, Island educators are apt to refer to that body as the real school board of the state. The equalization values realized by such a system far outweigh arguments for any shift toward the decentralized pattern of other states. To a degree this attitude is influenced by the marked imbalance of population and taxable wealth among the major islands. On Oahu reside three-fourths of the population and much of the tax base of the state. Equalization is a constant concern for all types of government services, but particularly schooling. The degree of centralization for school services is matched by virtually all other services, with a tax and financing structure to match.

Election of School Board?

Instead, the battle has raged around the method of selection of the state board of educational control. Legislation has been introduced annually on the subject since 1957, but no changes have been enacted. The current session of the state legislature saw the introduction of H.B. 2 calling for a constitutional amendment to Section 2, Article IX (quoted above) which permits the governor to appoint the state school board. In a legislative newsletter, the majority leader of the House of Representatives, Howard Y. Miyake, states the case for his party:

House Democrats feel that the basic question involved in H.B. 2 is: Should the voters be allowed to decide for themselves whether the State Board of Education should be elected by

the people or appointed by the Governor? It is difficult to understand why the majority of Republican legislators, in effect, lack confidence in the voters, whom they consider intelligent enough to elect them into office, to determine this issue. . . .

In the same newsletter, Republican minority leader Joseph Garcia, Jr., responds:

. . . We . . . contend that Hawaii's present educational system does not lend itself to popular election of school board members. Our board of education does not now, nor would it even if elected, levy taxes, spend money unless it is appropriated by the Legislature, or add to or subtract from the school program as provided by the Legislature. The Republican minority further believes that an elected school board of education will destroy direct lines of responsibility. With its members elected directly by the people, the board would not be responsible either to the Governor or the Legislature. Hence, should a poor school system result, the public would be hard pressed to place the blame on one elected body or person.

In hearings on the bill, spokesmen for a teachers' organization and a labor organization supported its passage. Representative of the Chamber of Commerce and the administration of the public school department supported a continuation of the appointive system. While the bill passed the House of Representatives on a partisan vote, it has been effectively bottled up in the state senate by a Republican majority. Should the question be put to a public referendum vote, this writer predicts a vote favorable to direct election of the school board.

The Hawaii Congress of Parents and Teachers, its own ranks torn by dissension over the issue, attempts to straddle the question in a 1960 report, saying:

We believe that the elective process should appear within the school department . . . either elected advisory councils or an elected State Board. We do not believe that either election or appointment of the State Board of Education is, in itself, the determining factor for improving the school system.

This statewide organization calls, rather, for larger fiscal powers for the state board, more independence from legislative controls and an elimination of dual county responsibility for erecting and maintaining schools.

With state appointive school boards the

times more numerous than elected boards in the mainland United States states, it does not seem likely that Hawaii will change its system in the near future.

Emerging from this conflict of opinion are several areas of agreement, however:

1. Hawaii generally favors a continuation of a centralized school system.
2. There is strong support for more involvement of the people in the affairs of their schools than can be provided by quasi-official P.T.A. organizations.
3. Despite a large private school enrollment (18 per cent), the citizenry generally is favorable to increased financial support for education, however structured.

Present Levels of Support

Last year 5,252 teachers and other school personnel were handling 140,666 public school children. Two-thirds of that teaching force had five years or more of collegiate training. Only 13 per cent had less than a bachelor's degree, the remaining graduates of the former two-year Territorial Normal School of the 1920's. With a single state-wide salary schedule ranging from \$325 to \$525 monthly, Hawaii enjoys a stable teaching force unusually well prepared and dedicated to their task. Expanding at a rate nearly double that of the nation, the state has had the usual problems of growth familiar to most communities. Yet all new construction has been of first quality and at a pace sufficient to avoid the necessity of "double-shifting" of students. As a federal "impact" area, Hawaii has received substantial P.L. 815 and 874 funds from Congress; nearly 10 per cent of the total amounts expended for education in Hawaii. Per capita expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance was \$353.31 last year, excluding capital outlay and debt service. The total expenditure level was \$402.09, including these latter two items.

While this is not tops for the nation, for a state at the national average in per capita income, it indicates a very favorable level of support. More importantly, the level of support is the same whether a child attends a metropolitan Honolulu high school or a rural island twelve-grade consolidated institution. With centralization has come both

a high level of equalization and a significant savings in administrative costs. Only a cent and a half of each educational dollar is devoted to administrative overhead. Despite generally favorable results, Hawaii is no more self-satisfied with its schools than is the typical mainland community. The same issues related to standards of achievement, reading methods, educational television, and foreign language instruction have wracked this community. Whatever the ills, real or imagined, voices are not raised against Hawaii's unique centralization.

Hawaii Evaluates Centralization

Time has shown that the general quality of such an organization is dependent largely on the quality of leadership. Forward looking school boards and superintendents are able to make their influence felt quickly throughout the state. Conversely, less able leadership has had a deteriorating effect. The most favorable outcome, and one which is not so dependent on favorable leadership, has been a value inherent in centralized control itself—equalization of education opportunity. The poorest communities have approximately the same physical facilities, as extensive and as rich an educational program, and as well prepared and paid teachers. The levels of education from kindergarten to high school are available to children of rural districts as quickly and completely as to those in urban areas.

The axiom that the wealth of the state should be used freely to bring up the level of education in less economically favored regions has been adopted and practiced in Hawaii for over a century. There is no likelihood of a change in such a basic policy. For despite the bureaucratic potentialities of centralized control, in practice considerable freedom has been allowed individual schools to develop their own programs. Past isolated efforts to standardize education have broken down, whether attempted through curriculum guides, state-wide examinations, or doctrines of methodology. Apparently a people dedicated to the democratic solution of problems will not long permit a bureaucratic domination of their public schools. Hawaii's experience is that a free people will keep their schools free, whatever the scheme for organizing them may be.

Current Documents

On March 14, 1961, Monsignor Frederick G. Hochwalt, director of the Education Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, urged federal aid for parochial schools to a Senate subcommittee studying the Administration's education bill. On March 17, 1961, Robert E. Van Deusen, on behalf of the National Lutheran Council, opposed federal aid to private and parochial schools in a statement before the House of Representatives' Education and Labor Subcommittee. Excerpts of these two statements follow:

THE CATHOLIC STATEMENT ON A SEPARATE SCHOOL-LOAN BILL

My name is Frederick G. Hochwalt. I am the director of the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. It is the function of my department to coordinate the national interests of the parochial school system in the 50 states.

This school system includes 10,300 elementary schools and approximately 2,400 high schools. These schools are staffed by more than 102,000 teachers, 40,000 of whom are laymen. The parochial elementary and secondary schools together enroll more than 5,000,000 students.

These schools are established, operated and maintained by Catholic citizens, by people of the same income group as those living about the neighboring public schools. Catholic schools, like public schools, aim for a proper balance of character building, scholarship and bodily development and are founded on the conviction that moral training is an essential part of education. These schools are no alien growth, but a sturdy native plant. They were first in the field of education in this country. . . .

They are integrally a part of what is basically a dual system. Public and private schools form a necessary partnership for the fruitful service of this country. . . .

Although the parochial schools are not governmentally sponsored and operated, they perform a public function, supplying large numbers of children with an education accepted by the state as fulfilling its requirements of compulsory education and meeting its specific standards.

. . . The question of whether or not there ought to be federal aid is a judgment to be based on objective, economic facts connected

with the schools of the country and consequently Catholic citizens should take a position in accordance with the facts.

As on many questions there is a division of Catholic conviction in this area. . . . Many parents of parochial school children . . . feel the . . . burden of supporting two school systems and are apt to inquire much more pointedly now than heretofore why the proponents of federal aid do not take into consideration their needs.

. . . The federal aid to education which has come from the Government in the past seems in the main part to have been a reasonable form of government assistance. The original and the later amended land-grant allocations, the provision for college housing, the school lunch program, the G.I. Bill and the National Defense Education Act are good examples of how a government can interest itself in the welfare of its people.

This body of legislators now has before it an impressive list of proposed measures to strengthen American education by federal assistance; and a great deal of emphasis is placed in these proposals on schoolhouse construction. I am particularly interested in S. 1021, the Administration's education bill. With reference to it may I emphasize that the decision to have federal funds for school house construction is one for the American people and the American legislators to make on the basis of sound evidence. If that evidence is sound and if the voice of the people is heard in a request for federal aid, then surely it will come about. But if it does, should not the American people be concerned about all of the schools of this great

nation? If an intellectual and scientific break-through is to be realized, if excellence is to be achieved, who can tell whence will come the leadership for the nation, from the public schools, or from their partners in education, the private schools.

What can be done for the private school and, in particular, the parochial school? We have the courageous example of government aid to our colleges without discrimination. My petition today points up the need to grant similar assistance to the elementary and secondary schools by way of long-term, low-interest-rate loans, with the interest rate computed on an annual basis. To grant federal assistance to only part of the American educational effort is to deny to the other parts the chance to grow. In fact it hinders parents in that free choice of education which is essentially theirs. The federal government ought not to take any steps which would force the private schools out of business or, in effect, to deny to parents the right

to choose their kind of schools.

We regard ourselves as an enlightened democracy giving leadership to Western civilization, and yet other lands, guided by democratic principles, have solved this problem of educational assistance. . . . Systems of education under the auspices of church groups, subsidized in whole or a great part by the government, are operated with success in England, Ireland, Scotland, Belgium, Holland, several provinces of Canada and elsewhere.

It is unthinkable that this great nation would embark for the first time on a massive program of federal encouragement to education by leaving out of consideration that dedicated group of parents and educators who have contributed so much to the welfare of this nation. We are proud of the products of the parochial school system. They are first-class citizens and their children and their children's children ought to be treated as such.

TEXT OF LUTHERAN STATEMENT ON SCHOOL AID

My name is Robert E. Van Deusen. I am the Washington secretary of the Division of Public Relations of the National Lutheran Council. The council is a cooperative agency of six Lutheran church bodies having a total membership of over 5,000,000.

The National Lutheran Council, at its annual meeting in Atlantic City in February, 1960, passed a resolution which said in part:

"Resolved: That the National Lutheran Council views with concern the proposal made in connection with legislation currently before the Congress which would authorize loans to non-public elementary and secondary schools for the construction of school buildings, on the basis that:

"(A) Government aid for the construction of church-operated schools at the elementary and secondary level is clearly a form of tax support for sectarian instruction; and

"(B) The availability of such aid to non-public schools would facilitate with public funds the establishment of racially segregated private schools as an alternative to integration in the public schools."

Last week, the Division of Public Relations of the National Lutheran Council,

meeting in Washington, noted the relevance and timeliness of the resolution passed by the council a year earlier, and released the following statement on March 9:

"It is clear from this statement that the council stands in opposition to the proposals now being advocated which would authorize federal loans or grants to non-public elementary and secondary schools.

"While advocating the right of any religious group to establish and maintain its own schools, it should be emphatically emphasized that the existence of such schools does not in any way constitute a claim on public funds, either for grants or loans, or for salaries of teachers and administrators.

"Obviously the extension of public grants or credits to private or parochial schools would raise grave questions of constitutionality, since it would clearly be a form of tax support for sectarian instruction.

"It would also constitute an invitation to sectarian groups to expand their schools beyond their ability to support them, and would encourage other groups to establish schools either for sectarian instruction or to

(Continued on page 117)

Received At Our Desk

On Education . . .

EDUCATION AND AMERICAN HISTORY. Special Issue of the Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 31, No. 2, Spring, 1961. (Cambridge: Graduate School of Education, Harvard University. 234 pages, \$1.10.)

In this set of 6 essays by eminent historians and educators, with companion book reviews, the authors attempt to relate the educational system of a given period to broader social and intellectual trends of their day. In the introduction, Oscar Handlin comments that "at the point at which historians began to look at the educational process, rather than at the school, they were compelled to consider a broad range of relationships to the totality of culture. The most promising developments have come through viewing the history of education as an aspect either of social or of intellectual history."

Each of the essays in the volume can be recommended on its own merits; together they make a valuable collection. Richard Storr's "The Education of History," Wilson Smith's "The New Historian of American Education," Frederick Rudolph's "Who Paid the Bills?," Frank Freidel's "The Education of Franklin D. Roosevelt," Timothy Smith's "Progressivism in American Education, 1880-1900," and David B. Tyack's "Education and Social Unrest, 1873-1878" provide "some clues to the complex interaction of school and society. . . ." T.H.B.

PROSPECT FOR AMERICA: THE ROCKEFELLER PANEL REPORTS. (New York: Doubleday & Company, 1961. 486 pages, index, \$3.95.)

In recent years a number of reports and essays have dealt with the challenges facing America. The essays are usually written by able men, leaders in the fields of science, government, education, and mili-

tary affairs. However, the efforts to articulate effectively concepts such as "national purpose" or "goals for the future" invariably suffer from vagueness and over-generalization. In a sense, this is inevitable. How can an essayist communicate the "essence of freedom" to a reader?

In 1956, the Special Studies Project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund undertook: "1) To define the major problems and opportunities that will challenge the United States over the next ten to fifteen years; 2) To clarify the national purposes and objectives that must inspire and direct the meeting of such great challenges; and 3) to develop a framework of concepts and principles on which national policies and decisions can be soundly based."

The papers published in this volume represent the fruits of three years of discussion and analysis. They provide a lucid, sophisticated introduction to the problems confronting American leaders as we move into the 1960's. The problems concern military security, foreign aid, economic development and aid to underdeveloped areas, domestic growth, educational reform and the elimination of discrimination from all areas of our society.

"Within America, prosperous and technically at peace, the problems multiply: the slow progress in solving racial tension, the continuing question of economic growth with stability, the complex agricultural problem, the deterioration of our cities, the financial difficulties of transportation, the need for more schools, more teachers, and improved quality in education." The challenges are great. Will the necessary responses be forthcoming?

A.Z.R.

On History and Politics . . .

THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA. EDITED BY RICHARD PIPES. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1961. 234

pages, appendix, glossary, and index, \$4.50.)

Historically, revolutionaries and social reformers have come primarily from the "intelligentsia." Although this term lacks any precise definition, there is little disagreement as to the significance of the intelligentsia as a group to the functioning and stability of society. Richard Pipes, Professor of History at Harvard University, has edited a valuable series of essays on "the condition and prospects" of the intelligentsia in Russia, before and after the revolution of 1917.

He notes that "in Russia the question of the social function and historic mission of the intellectuals always had and still has a particular urgency, first of all, because the early and rapid Westernization of the country produced an extraordinarily large, virile, and self-conscious body of intellectuals, and, second, because there modernization has been carried out with greater intensity and single-mindedness than anywhere else in the world."

The twelve contributors are a distinguished group. Their essays are erudite, informative and well-written. Martin Malia, Leonard Schapiro and Boris Elkin discuss the character "of the pre-Revolutionary intelligentsia, in particular, its attitude toward civic responsibility." Richard Pipes then traces the different strands of the intelligentsia—the "cultural" and the "philosophical"—as they developed in Russia. The latter group became influential in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and were influenced by Western "rationalist" thinking, with its "monistic view of nature, socialism (in some one of its several forms), and the idea of revolution."

Leopold Labedz defines the term "intelligentsia," in relation to contemporary Soviet society. "David Burg describes, on the basis of extensive personal experience and a close study of Soviet printed sources,

the social and political attitudes of students at higher educational institutions in the Soviet Union. Leopold H. Haimson traces the conflict between generations of intellectuals, in particular, that between the present-day younger generation and the one that came of age in the heyday of Stalinism. Max Hayward takes a look at professional Soviet writers. Finally, David Joravsky and Gustav Wetter discuss the relationship between the natural scientists and official ideology in the Soviet Union in the first two decades of the Communist regime, and since the death of Stalin, respectively."

There are also two essays—by Julián Mariás and Benjamin Schwartz—on intellectuals in contemporary Spain and Communist China.

A.Z.R.

CONTEMPORARY ARAB POLITICS: A CONCISE HISTORY. By GEORGE E. KIRK. (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961. 161 pages, appendix, bibliography, and index, \$5.00.)

The Middle East has for centuries been a crossroads for aspiring conquerors. It still retains an important measure of strategic significance. Developments in the area are complex and not readily fitted into any analytical pattern.

Mr. Kirk provides a hurried sketch of recent developments in the United Arab Republic, Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq. Essentially, he concentrates on the revolutions and revolutionary changes of the 1956-1960 period.

The student with no substantial background in Middle Eastern affairs will find this essay inadequate to any greater understanding of the area's problems; the advanced student will find himself confronted with an analysis which raises more questions than it answers. Provocative formulations are interwoven with caustic commentaries. The net result is disappointing.

A.Z.R.

(Continued from page 115)

preserve racial segregation, thereby also weakening our traditional American public school system.

"Therefore, any bills or amendments in

the Congress which would authorize public funds for non-public primary or secondary education would not be in the best interests of our nation."

The Month in Review

INTERNATIONAL

Berlin Crisis

June 5—U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk tells the North Atlantic Council the U.S. cannot accept the Soviet memorandum on Germany and Berlin as a basis for new negotiations. The memorandum (of June 4) calls for the signing of a peace treaty with East and West Germany and establishment of Berlin as a demilitarized free city.

June 15—Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev says the Soviet Union will push for conclusion of a German peace treaty this year. He asserts if this cannot be done by East-West agreement, it will be done unilaterally with East Germany. (See also *Germany, U.S.S.R. and U.S., Foreign Policy*.)

June 27—British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan declares that Britain is willing to negotiate the Berlin question with the Soviet Union; he affirms Allied insistence on maintaining "the freedom of the people of Berlin."

June 28—U.S. President Kennedy declares that Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev must accept the principle of self-determination in Berlin and in all Europe if negotiation on the Berlin issue is to be "profitable."

A decree in the East German official gazette announces that all foreign aircraft that plan to fly over East German territory must register with an East German air safety center.

June 29—The U.S. State Department rejects East Germany's claim that it can impose curbs on air travel over East Germany.

June 30—Representatives of the Western governments confer in Washington to draft a reply to the Soviet memorandum of June 4.

Disarmament

June 12—The U.S.S.R. tells the U.S. and Britain that they must either accept the Soviet terms for a treaty banning nuclear

tests or else merge the 2½-year-old talks with broader disarmament negotiations. The Soviet delegate says his country will never retreat from its proposal for a 3-man council to administer test ban controls.

June 19—Soviet and U.S. officials meet in Washington to make arrangements for a general disarmament conference. (See also *U.S. Foreign Policy*.)

June 30—U.S. President Kennedy confers with Valerian A. Zorin, chief Soviet disarmament negotiator and head of the Soviet delegation to the U.N., to try to break the deadlock in talks to set up a general disarmament conference.

European Economic Community (Common Market)

June 6—France officially warns that further tariff-cutting in the Common Market will stop after this year unless the nations agree on a common agricultural policy, scheduled to go into effect in 1962.

June 12—Association of Greece with the Common Market receives final approval from the 6 member countries.

June 20—The European Parliament meets in Strasbourg, France. Of the 250 men, duly elected members of national parliaments, 103 are African members from 16 former colonies. The group will try to reach agreement on associating the African nations with the Common Market.

European Free Trade Association (Outer Seven)

June 28—The E.F.T.A. Ministerial Council issues a joint communiqué ending 2 days of talks. The talks affirm the unity of the Seven, which agree to act as a group in making any agreement with the Common Market.

International Labor Organization

June 29—The I.L.O., at its 45th conference, approves a resolution asking South Africa to resign. South Africa refuses.

Summit Talks

June 3—U.S. President John F. Kennedy

and Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev open their 2-day summit talks with a 4-hour "frank and courteous" discussion of world problems.

June 4—The summit talks end with a limited agreement on Laos and sharp disagreement on Germany, Berlin, control of nuclear testing and disarmament. (See also *U.S.S.R.* and *U.S. Foreign Policy*.)

United Nations

June 8—A special investigating committee of the Trusteeship Council accuses the U.S. of seriously neglecting the economy of its Pacific Trust islands and complains of uninspired colonial management.

June 9—By a vote of 9 to 0, with Britain and France abstaining, the Security Council adopts a resolution calling on Portugal to "desist forthwith from repressive measures" in Angola.

June 21—An 8-member review board unanimously recommends 100 more key posts for Soviet-bloc citizens and more jobs for Africans and Asians to correct a "geographic inequality" in the U.N. staff. The board splits on such key issues as the role of the Secretary General and budget policy.

June 26—U.N. Executive Assistant Andrew W. Cordier resigns; he was the official who worked most directly with the Secretary General. Cordier, succeeded by Chakravarthi V. Narasimhan, will remain at the U.N. on special assignment as Under Secretary for General Assembly Affairs.

AFGHANISTAN

June 6—Premier Mohammed Daoud accuses Pakistan of using U.S. jet aircraft in "cruel and savage bombing of peoples who are fighting for their freedom." He denies that his country has promoted or participated in recent fighting in tribal wars in northwestern Pakistan.

June 18—The Kabul radio announces that the government has proposed a meeting of the heads of state of Afghanistan and Pakistan and has suggested the meeting be held in Afghanistan. (See also *The British Commonwealth, Pakistan*.)

AUSTRIA (See also *Italy*.)

June 5—The lawyer for Archduke Otto von Hapsburg submits to Chancellor Alfons

Gorbach the pretendant's signed statement renouncing the throne and declaring loyalty to the Second Austrian government. It is requested that the law of banishment against him be lifted.

June 13—The government rejects a declaration of loyalty by Otto von Hapsburg and bars his return.

BOLIVIA

June 15—Violent demonstrations, in which at least 3 persons are killed and 5 injured by police, erupt in La Paz as Adlai Stevenson arrives for a 2-day state visit. The demonstrators demand the release of imprisoned labor leaders.

June 23—The government orders the Cuban Chargé d'Affaires in La Paz to leave the country. He is charged with being directly involved in a Communist plot to overthrow the government.

BRAZIL

June 10—The government sends additional reinforcements by sea and air to Recife after striking students resist troops. The students protest a university ban on a meeting where the mother of Cuba's Minister of Industries will speak.

June 11—Stevenson arrives in Brazil for 2 days of talks with head officials.

June 16—The students vote to end their 17-day strike.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH, THE Canada

June 13—James Coyne, governor of the Bank of Canada, reveals that his immediate resignation has been demanded by Donald Fleming, Minister of Finance. He says he refuses to resign and will continue until his contract expires. Fleming maintains that Coyne's insistence on maintaining high interest rates is at odds with the government's "expansionist policy aimed at the creation of more trade, more production and more jobs."

June 20—Finance Minister Fleming presents the government's budget. He forecasts a deficit of \$650 million.

June 21—The Canadian dollar falls to a 10-year low on major exchange markets.

June 26—The Canadian government asks Parliament for a vote of confidence on its

decision to dismiss Bank Governor Coyne.

Meeting in Ottawa with Canadian Prime Minister John Diefenbaker, Japanese Premier Hayato Ikeda declares that Japanese imports from Canada will double in the next 10 years.

Great Britain (See also *Kuwait*.)

June 4—U.S. President Kennedy arrives in London for a 28-hour visit with British leaders.

June 5—Prime Minister Harold Macmillan and Kennedy agree that Soviet willingness to negotiate on Laos shall be considered a test of Moscow's global intentions. They also agree on the need for maintaining Allied rights and obligations in Berlin. (See also *International, Berlin Crisis*.)

June 13—Macmillan announces he is sending some of his senior ministers to other Commonwealth countries for discussions on whether, and on what conditions, Britain should join the European Common Market.

June 27—Dr. Arthur Michael Ramsey is enthroned as the one hundredth Archbishop of Canterbury and Primate of All England.

India

June 2—The International Bank and 6 nations—the U.S., Britain, Canada, France, West Germany and Japan—agree to provide \$2.2 billion in aid to India over the next 2 years.

June 11—Results of polling held between June 2-8 give the Congress party a decisive victory in the State of Orissa. This gives Nehru's party majorities in all state legislatures.

Pakistan

June 8—Finance Minister Mohammed Shoaib says he is disappointed in the recent decision of the International Bank and 6 nations to commit themselves to only \$320 million in aid in the next year. Pakistan asked for \$945 million for the next 2 years.

June 18—in answer to an Afghan invitation, President Mohammad Ayub Khan is said to be willing to hold talks provided he is satisfied with the sincerity of the offer. (See also *Afghanistan*.)

BRITISH EMPIRE, THE

Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

June 1—Duncan Sandys, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, and Sir Edgar Whitehead, Prime Minister of Southern Rhodesia, announce they have reached agreement on all points of the colony's new constitution. A referendum is to be held in late July.

June 26—British Secretary of State for the Colonies Iain Macleod tells the House of Commons of proposals to change the Northern Rhodesian constitution to increase the number of Africans in the legislature. Macleod also proposes that some 500 more Africans be allowed to qualify as voters on the "upper roll."

June 27—Northern Rhodesia's Kenneth Kaunda, President of the United National Independence party, condemns the British proposals.

June 28—Kaunda issues a joint declaration with President of the National Democratic party of Southern Rhodesia Joshua Nkomo, in which these 2 principal political leaders agree to oppose the British constitutional revisions.

Mauritius

June 26—Macleod opens a conference in London to review the constitution of this island colony.

West Indies Federation

June 16—The London Constitutional Conference ends.

June 17—The Colonial Office announces that the West Indies Federation will become independent on May 31, 1962, if its members accept the proposed constitution.

June 28—in a White Paper, Secretary of State for the Colonies Iain Macleod tells Parliament that the proposed constitution provides for a loose federation of the uni territories.

Zanzibar

June 1—A state of emergency and a dusk-to-dawn curfew are established after a day of rioting touched off by local elections.

June 5—As rioting continues between Arab and Africans, 47 are reported killed and 300 injured.

CHINA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF

June 20—The Soviet Union and Communist China sign a new agreement for economic, scientific and technical co-operation. There is no indication that the Chinese will receive large-scale aid.

**CONGO, REPUBLIC OF THE
(Leopoldville)**

June 12—U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, reporting that the political crisis in the Congo appears to be over, announces a \$10 million U.N. loan. In exchange, Congolese President Joseph Kasavubu agrees to freeze wages, to trim the growing public payroll and to keep in line the Congo's 25,000-man army.

June 13—Colonel Guy Weber of Belgium, Katanga President Moise Tshombe's main military adviser, agrees to leave Katanga Province when threatened with arrest and deportation by the U.N.

June 18—U.N. forces return to the Congo's only seaport, Matadi, from which they were evicted 3 months ago.

June 19—Delegates from Kasavubu's Leopoldville government and Antoine Gizza's Stanleyville regime reach agreement on a meeting of the Congolese National Parliament, to be held under the protection of the U.N.

June 20—20 Katanga Province Deputies and Senators declare that Katanga is "no longer a part of the former Republic of the Congo" and that they will boycott the Parliament.

June 22—Tshombe is released from political detention. He promises to cooperate with the central government but makes it clear he still disagrees with the Leopoldville regime and considers his political power unbroken.

June 24—The leaders of the 3 rival regimes promise the U.N. they will cooperate for a July 2 opening of Parliament.

June 25—The Leopoldville government announces that Tshombe yesterday agreed to drop Katanga's secession.

June 27—It is announced in a communiqué, that Tshombe and Katanga Foreign Minister Evariste Kimba will take a 30-day leave. The 3-man College of Ministers will run the government.

June 28—Tshombe, reversing his agreement

to end Katanga's secession, announces that he will work to "defend an independent Katanga."

June 29—Tshombe states that he will send delegates to the national Congolese Parliament in Leopoldville; but that the Parliament should not convene until Congolese political leaders have met.

June 30—The Congo celebrates its first year of independence. Kasavubu reviews a parade in Leopoldville.

CUBA

June 2—The Tractors for Freedom Committee informs Premier Fidel Castro that it is ready to send him the 500 tractors in exchange for 1,214 prisoners captured after the April attack.

June 7—Castro tells the Tractors for Freedom Committee that he insists upon direct personal negotiations in Havana.

June 9—The Tractors Committee announces that 4 technical experts will go to Havana to discuss exchange details.

June 13—A group of U.S. experts on farm machinery confers in Havana with President Osvaldo Dorticós Torrado.

June 14—Castro tells U.S. negotiators that he will accept tractors rather than bulldozers, provided the value of the farm machinery is equal to that of 500 bulldozers, or \$28 million.

June 19—The Tractors for Freedom Committee tells Castro of its willingness to send 500 agricultural tractors for the release of some 1,200 prisoners, but insists it will not send more than 500 nor will it send heavy bulldozers.

June 23—Terming the committee's terms "ridiculous," Castro renews his demands for \$28 million worth of tractors. The committee decides to disband.

June 30—Executive Secretary of the Tractors for Freedom Committee John Hooker, Jr., tells Premier Castro it will not resume negotiations to exchange tractors-for-prisoners.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

June 24—A shake-up in the government and Communist party is announced. Interior Minister Rudolf Barak is dismissed and Minister of Agriculture Lubomir Strougal is appointed in his place.

Strougal is relieved of his functions in the Party Secretariat; Barak remains a deputy premier.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, THE

June 1—Lieutenant General Rafael Trujillo, Jr., is named to head the armed forces following the assassination of his father last week.

June 2—The U.S. requests the Organization of American States to send a special investigating committee to the Dominican Republic to try to prevent further repression in the wake of Trujillo's assassination.

The government announces that one of the alleged assassins has been killed and that 3 others of the 7 involved have been captured.

June 5—Foreign Minister Porfirio Herrera Baez flies to Washington and informs a special O.A.S. committee that his government welcomes a fact-finding mission. The O.A.S. votes to send an investigating team.

June 7—An investigating commission of the O.A.S. arrives in Ciudad Trujillo.

June 8—Major General José René Ramón Fernandez is relieved of his post as Secretary of State for the Armed Services.

June 11—It is officially announced that General Ramón has confessed to complicity in the May 30 assassination of Generalissimo Trujillo.

June 15—The O.A.S. investigating subcommittee returns to Washington. The U.S. indicates it is not satisfied with the length or the thoroughness of the inquiry.

FINLAND

June 19—Ahti Karjalainen, former Trade Minister, is named Foreign Minister. He succeeds Ralf G. Torngren, who died May 15.

June 29—Premier Vieno J. Sukselainen resigns following his conviction yesterday by a Helsinki court. The Court charged he was implicated in a housing scandal connected with his position as director general of the board of the Finnish State Pensions Institution.

FRANCE

June 2—President Charles de Gaulle and

U.S. President Kennedy conclude 3 days of talks. The official communiqué states that they are in firm agreement on Berlin's defense and better informed of each other's views on nuclear weapons, foreign aid and Laos.

June 5—Major Elie Denoix de Saint Marc is sentenced to 10 years in prison for having led the First Foreign Legion Parachute Regiment into mutiny in April.

June 7—Lieutenant General Charles Aillerat replaces General Fernand Gambiez in a major shake-up in the French military command in Algeria.

June 9—20 Left-wing journalists are arrested and an extreme Right-wing paper is suppressed under de Gaulle's special emergency powers.

June 17—In the wake of widespread farmer demonstrations in Brittany, the government announces support prices for potatoes, butter and poultry.

June 19—1000 Brittany farmers, protesting against falling farm prices, surround and block off the prefecture of the Vendée Department in La-Roche-sur-Yon. After 6 hours, the demonstrations end.

General Jean Nicot, who authorized the flight to Algeria of 2 generals who led the April mutiny, is sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment.

June 20—West German President Heinrich Luebke arrives in Paris for an official visit. He is the first German chief of state ever to visit the country as a friend and ally.

June 29—Farmer and government leaders meet. They issue a communiqué announcing new price supports, demanded by farmers.

FRANCE OVERSEAS

Algeria

June 2—Algerian nationalist delegates insist that Algerian self-determination must apply to the Sahara region as well as to "Mediterranean Algeria" and tell French negotiators they will never compromise on this issue.

June 6—at the peace talks at Evian-les-Bains, the Algerian delegates offer citizenship in an independent Algeria to all Europeans who wish to choose it. For those who wish to remain French, the

nationalists propose to negotiate "guarantees" with the French government.

June 12—A communiqué issued in Tunis by Presidents Habib Bourguiba of Tunisia and Modibo Keita of Mali calls the Sahara "an integral part of African territory" and not Algerian, as Algerian nationalists insist.

June 13—The French break off the 3-week-old peace talks for an indefinite "period of reflection."

June 15—France extends her unilateral cease-fire in Algeria indefinitely.

June 27—President Charles de Gaulle announces that he has ordered the withdrawal of one French army division from Algeria. At an informal meeting with reporters, de Gaulle voices his intention to settle the Algerian crisis by partition if necessary before an anticipated Berlin crisis erupts in the fall.

GERMANY, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF (East)

June 15—Walter Ulbricht, East German Communist leader, threatens interference with Western air traffic to and from Berlin after the conclusion of a peace treaty. He says his government wants "full control of all traffic on land, on water and in the air." (See also *Int'l., Berlin Crisis.*)

GERMANY, FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF (West)

June 11—Chancellor Konrad Adenauer declares that West Germany will never approve a separate peace treaty between the Soviet Union and East Germany. He also rules out negotiations between the two Germanys as long as East Germany is a Soviet satellite.

IRAQ

June 25—Premier Abdul Karim Kassim says Kuwait is an "integral part" of Iraq and that he will soon appoint the present Sheik of Kuwait as Governor of the Kuwait district. (See also *Kuwait.*)

June 26—Sheik Abdullah al-Salim al-Sabah of Kuwait says he will fight to maintain Kuwait's sovereignty against Iraqi claims.

June 27—U.A.R. President Gamal Abdel Nasser announces his support of Kuwait's independence. A state of emergency is proclaimed in Kuwait.

June 29—Britain orders naval vessels toward Kuwait.

June 30—Kuwait applies for U.N. membership.

Great Britain asks the U.S., the U.A.R. and other Middle Eastern states to take joint action if necessary to restrain Iraq.

ISRAEL

June 1—Dr. Israel Beer, prominent figure in Israeli military circles, goes on trial on charges that he spied for an unidentified Communist power.

June 20—The prosecution ends its presentation in the Eichmann case. Adolf Eichmann takes the stand in his own defense and claims that he was too unimportant a Nazi to have been responsible for the killing of Jews.

June 26—Election lists are closed. It is revealed that 15 political parties have entered the general elections scheduled for August 15.

ITALY

June 20—Tension continues in Alto Adige as terrorists attempt to blow up bridges. The agitation of the German-speaking population for autonomy increases.

June 24—Italian and Austrian delegates meet in Zurich to discuss the issue of South Tyrol (Alto Adige).

June 25—The South Tyrol negotiations become deadlocked and both countries agree to seek outside mediation.

JAPAN

June 3—Despite violent student demonstrations, the lower house passes an anti-violence measure. The bill is aimed at controlling all acts of political violence.

June 7—The government agrees to postpone upper house action on its anti-violence measure. More than 1,000 persons have been injured in 5 days of demonstrations against the bill.

June 19—Premier Hayato Ikeda leaves for a state visit to the U.S. (See also *U.S., Foreign Policy and Brit. Commonwealth, Canada.*)

JORDAN

June 28—A Cabinet reshuffle is announced. Premier Barjat Abdul Khadr Talhouni will take over the foreign affairs ministry. Foreign Affairs Minister Musa Nasir is

one of 4 Cabinet members who were dropped.

KOREA, SOUTH

June 3—The new military government picks General Chung Il-Kwon, former chief of staff, as ambassador to the U.S.

June 6—The military junta decrees an absolute military dictatorship with power concentrated in a few officers. Lieutenant General Chang Do Young relinquishes his posts as army chief of staff and defense minister but retains his positions as chairman of the junta and chief of the 14-man cabinet.

June 30—U.S. Army Lieutenant General Guy S. Meloy, Jr., succeeds General Carter B. Magruder as head of the U.N. Command in Korea. Magruder is retiring.

KUWAIT

June 19—Kuwait gains its independence. The British protectorate is ended. Britain cancels the arrangement under which Kuwait agreed not to receive envoys of other powers or dispose of her territory without British consent. Britain signs a treaty of friendship with the sheikdom and assures the country of British protection if it is requested. (See also *Iraq*.)

LAOS

June 5—The 14-nation Geneva conference on Laos resumes after a 4-day recess called during the Kennedy-Khrushchev Vienna meeting.

June 8—The U.S., Britain and France agree they cannot attend further sessions of the Geneva conference until rebel truce violations have ceased.

June 12—The Geneva conference resumes following private talks between British Foreign Secretary Lord Home and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko. The Western proposals for safeguarding the political integrity and neutrality of Laos are denounced by Communist China's Foreign Minister Marshal Chen Yi. Thailand's delegation announces it will boycott the conference until the present "unequitable" Laotian representation is corrected.

June 17—The Laotian government reveals that the rebels have captured at least 19

loyalist military posts and positions since they agreed to a cease-fire on May 3. Pathet Lao patrols have pushed to within 13 miles of Vientiane, the nation's capital.

June 19—The 3 leaders of Laos begin negotiations in Zurich on forming a coalition government. The 3 are Prince Boun Oum, Premier of the pro-Western royal government, Prince Souvanna Phouma, neutralist leader supported by the Communist bloc, and Prince Souphanouvong, head of the Pathet Lao (Communist guerrilla) forces.

June 22—The 3 princes announce their intention to form a national union government representing their 3 parties. The statement does not say when the government will be formed, who will head it and how the cabinet posts will be distributed.

June 27—The U.S. invites General Phoumi Nosavan, defense minister and deputy premier in the Royal Lao government, and neutralist leader Prince Souvanna Phouma to Washington for consultations.

June 28—Nosavan arrives in Washington for talks with U.S. leaders.

June 29—Rightist Premier Boun Oum arrives in Thailand en route to Laos from Zurich.

MEXICO

June 7—President Adolfo Lopez Mateos warns that his government will not tolerate further attacks on the "national tranquility."

MOROCCO

June 7—In the first legislative act of his reign, King Hassan II promulgates a Fundamental Law establishing the principles of government. He promises a constitution and democratic institutions but sets no date. A spokesman for the opposition National Union of Popular Forces says his group will "reject" the law and will increase its demands for elections and for a Constituent Assembly.

NEPAL

June 26—The U.S. agrees to give Nepal \$4.2 million in aid.

POLAND

June 27—First Secretary of the Polish United Workers (Communist) party Wladyslaw Gomulka announces that

some 850,000 acres, or 10 per cent of the arable land, will be collectivized.

PORUGAL**Angola**

June 17—Widespread and intensive rebel activities are renewed. (See also *International, U.N.*)

SOMALIA

June 13—It is revealed that earlier this month the Soviet Union granted Somalia loans totaling more than \$50 million.

SOUTH AFRICA, REPUBLIC OF

June 26—Prime Minister Hendrik F. Verwoerd declares that the U.N. investigating committee, which has been denied entry to South-west Africa, will not be admitted to the republic.

TUNISIA (See *France Overseas, Algeria.*)**U.S.S.R., THE**

June 5—President Sukarno of Indonesia arrives in Moscow for a state visit.

June 10—Premier Khrushchev promises Sukarno that the Soviet Union will support Indonesia's claim to Netherlands New Guinea.

June 15—Khrushchev reports to his people on the Vienna meeting with Kennedy. (See also *International, Berlin Crisis.*)

June 21—Khrushchev warns that the Soviet Union will start nuclear weapons tests "immediately" if the West resumes such explosions. (See also *International, Disarmament*, and *U.S., Foreign Policy.*)

UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, THE

June 3—Archbishop Makarios, president of Cyprus, arrives in Cairo for a week's official visit.

June 6—20 nations attend a Cairo preparatory conference to establish details for the forthcoming September neutralists' conference. Countries represented are the U.A.R., Afghanistan, Guinea, India, Ghana, Ethiopia, Cambodia, Nepal, Cuba, Indonesia, Yugoslavia, Morocco, Somalia, Saudi Arabia, Mali, Iraq, Yemen, Sudan, Ceylon and Burma.

UNITED STATES, THE**Foreign Policy**

June 1—Israeli Premier Ben-Gurion, ending his U.S. visit, says he has found a "large measure of agreement" with

Kennedy on the problem of the Palestine Arab refugees.

June 4—Adlai E. Stevenson begins his South American tour on behalf of Kennedy's Alliance for Progress program. A cheering airport crowd greets him in Caracas, Venezuela.

June 6—Kennedy reports to the nation on his Vienna talks with Khrushchev. He says the talks have reduced the chances of a "dangerous misjudgment by either side."

Stevenson arrives in Buenos Aires for 2 days of talks with Argentine leaders.

June 12—Kennedy and Premier Fanfani of Italy begin 2 days of discussions in Washington.

June 14—Senate majority leader Mike Mansfield urges that Berlin be made a free city under international protection. In a Senate speech designed to stimulate debate on Berlin, he says continuation of the status quo can lead only to nuclear war. (See also *International, Berlin Crisis, Disarmament* and *Summit Talks.*)

Representative Chet Holifield, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, urges the administration to renounce the voluntary moratorium on atomic tests and prepare to start weapons testing as soon as possible.

Kennedy talks with Nguyen Dinh Thuan of Vietnam, who reports that President Ngo Dinh Diem urges direct training of Vietnamese troops by the U.S. (See also *Vietnam, South.*)

Stevenson is cheered by hundreds of Chileans as he walks from his Santiago hotel to the presidential palace to confer with President Rodriguez. Yesterday demonstrators wrecked the U.S. Information Office in Chile.

June 15—Violent demonstrations and bloodshed erupt in La Paz as Stevenson arrives in Bolivia.

June 16—A Czech diplomat charges that U.S. intelligence agents tried to hire him as a spy and arranged for his expulsion when he refused. The U.S. charges that Miroslav Nacvalac, the counselor of the Czech delegation to the U.N., is a spy and asks that he be recalled.

Kennedy urges the nation to support

his \$8.8 billion foreign aid program to help stamp out the conditions causing communism.

June 19—Ecuador's President Velasco Ibarra tells Stevenson of his plans for a comprehensive economic and social program calling for immediate foreign credits totaling \$140 million.

Kennedy signs the agreement for the Inter-American Social Progress Trust Fund, under which \$394 million is assigned to the Inter-American Development Bank.

June 20—Arthur Dean, chief negotiator at the Geneva conference for a ban on nuclear testing, is recalled to Washington for consultations.

Japanese Premier Ikeda arrives in Washington.

June 21—Kennedy and Ikeda agree to the formation of a U.S.-Japanese economic committee on a ministerial level with top representatives of both governments taking part.

June 22—Stevenson returns from his Latin American trip. He says he will tell the President that the 10 countries he visited are in worse economic and social condition than they were a year ago, but that most governments now realize the need for social and economic reforms.

Charging that he is being forced out of the U.S. by "threats" and "lies" from Washington, Nacvalac leaves for Prague.

Secretary of State Rusk expresses concern over the "militant tone" of Soviet leaders on Berlin. He reaffirms the West's determination to stand fast on its rights in Berlin and says the U.S. plans to continue the nuclear test ban talks despite the "uncooperative attitude" of the Soviet Union.

Peace Corps Director Shriver tells Senators his group will extend no aid to countries that discriminate against American Jews and other groups.

The Commerce Department announces the U.S. will permit sales of subsidized farm products, including cotton textiles, to the Soviet Union and its European allies if they pay in dollars or currency convertible into dollars.

June 28—Kennedy announces that he has ordered a special panel of his Scientific

Advisory Committee to investigate the possibility of secret Soviet nuclear tests.

June 29—Kennedy sends to Congress a proposal to establish a United States Disarmament Agency for World Peace and Security.

Government

June 7—Kennedy sends Congress a proposal for a 3-part pilot program to supply jobs and training for the nation's youth.

June 8—The House votes to continue for another year the Korean War increases in corporate income and excise taxes.

June 13—Irvin Scarbeck, a career Foreign Service officer, is arrested for espionage.

DeLesseps S. Morrison, New Orleans mayor, is named ambassador to the O.A.S.

June 14—The Senate approves the nomination of Joseph C. Swidler as a commissioner of the Federal Power Commission.

June 15—The House kills Kennedy's proposal to reorganize the Federal Communications Commission.

Westinghouse and 3 other electrical manufacturers agree to sign an order against sales at "unreasonably low prices" that might lessen competition. G.E. refuses to comply with the government's demand.

June 16—Kennedy names Robert F. Woodward, ambassador to Chile, to be assistant secretary of state for Inter-American affairs.

June 19—A federal grand jury indicts Scarbeck on charges of giving classified information to Polish agents.

Robert Soble goes on trial on charges of spying from 1940 to 1960.

June 21—The Senate rejects the Kennedy proposal to reorganize the Securities and Exchange Commission.

June 26—Congress approves an \$11.5 billion interstate highway bill, and sends it to the President for his signature.

The first 2 contingents of Peace Corps volunteers begin their training programs.

June 27—Former Vice-President Richard M. Nixon declares that the President should end all "non-defense spending not directly concerned with national security."

June 28—The House and Senate approve a

compromise housing bill of approximately \$5 billion; it is sent to the President.

The Senate approves a \$5 billion rise in the national debt ceiling, which now reaches \$298 billion. The House has already approved the measure.

The fifty-third annual Conference of Governors, attended by 47 of the 54 state and territorial governors, in Honolulu ends.

June 29—Kennedy signs the bill setting up the U.S. Travel Service to promote foreign tourist vacations in the U.S.

The Senate and House approve a bill increasing social security payments for 4 million aged persons. The bill, which provides for a rise in the minimum monthly payment from \$33 to \$40 among other provisions, goes to the President.

The Senate approves the Administration's plan to reorganize the Federal Trade Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, earlier approved by the House.

Kennedy signs the interstate highway bill.

June 30—Kennedy signs the bill to increase social security benefits for some 4 million persons, and the housing bill.

The government ends the fiscal year with a deficit of approximately \$3 billion.

Labor

June 16—A nation-wide shipping strike begins as 5 seamen's unions walk out in a dispute over terms of a new contract. The primary point of difference is the union's demand that the companies agree to bargain not only for their U.S.-flag ships but also for "runaway" vessels owned by U.S. companies but sailing under foreign flags.

June 22—Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg proposes a 3-man panel to study issues in the seamen's strike and asks both sides to accept a 60-day cooling-off period.

June 23—Employers agree to accept the Goldberg proposal but the major unions reject it.

June 26—President Kennedy invokes the Taft-Hartley Act. The President appoints a 3-man board of inquiry to study the issues besetting 5 maritime unions and the shipowners for 11 days.

June 27—The executive council of the

A.F.L.-C.I.O. approves a statement asking Congress to give President Kennedy emergency powers to meet any world crisis.

June 28—At the opening of contract negotiations with General Motors, U.A.W. President Walter P. Reuther asks G.M. to lead the way in raising wages and providing greater job security for auto workers.

June 29—The executive council of the A.F.L.-C.I.O. ends a week-long meeting.

The U.A.W. opens contract negotiations with the Ford Motor Co.

President Kennedy extends until Monday, July 3, at 9 A.M. the deadline for the report by the 3-man board of inquiry investigating the maritime strike.

Military

June 6—Deputy Secretary of Defense Roswell Gilpatric tells a news conference that the Army will not need an increase in its present 875,000-man strength because of the increased mobilization readiness planned for its Reserve.

June 9—The Army says its minimum-size force should be 920,000 men to carry out Kennedy's plan for increasing the readiness of the Reserve forces.

June 12—Congress approves a \$12 billion authorization for the production of missiles, warships and planes. The measure contains \$525 million for adding manned bombers to the Strategic Air Command, a provision opposed by the Administration.

The Army announces the "admonishment" of Major General Walker for accusing prominent citizens of links with communism.

June 22—Vice Admiral George W. Anderson is named Chief of Naval Operations.

June 23—The X-15 rocket plane sets a speed record of 3,690 miles an hour.

June 26—President Kennedy announces that General Maxwell Taylor, former army chief of staff, has been called out of retirement to active service. He is named Military Representative of the President.

June 30—Air Force Chief of Staff Thomas D. White resigns. He is succeeded by General Curtis E. LeMay.

Politics

June 1—At a G.O.P. fund-raising dinner, Eisenhower assails the Kennedy administration with charges of "government by

Big Brother" and "immoral" deficit spending.

June 2—William E. Miller, representative from upstate New York, is unanimously elected chairman of the Republican National Committee.

Segregation

June 2—A federal district judge orders Freedom Riders and their supporters to halt tests of segregation on public transportation in Alabama. He also forbids Montgomery police to withhold protection from interstate passengers regardless of race. He enjoins Ku Klux Klansmen and their associates from interfering with such travel.

Six Freedom Riders are jailed in Jackson, Mississippi, making a total of 52 such arrests there.

June 14—A federal judge denies the Justice Department's request that it be allowed to intervene in a suit to open the public schools of Prince Edward County, Virginia, closed 2 years ago.

June 16—10 Freedom Riders refuse to obey a police order to disperse at the Tallahassee airport and are arrested.

June 26—The Justice Department brings suit to end segregation in restaurant facilities at the New Orleans airport terminal.

The Federal District Court upholds the Delaware State Board of Education's short- and long-term plans to end school segregation.

June 27—Field Secretary of CORE Gordon R. Carey announces the decision of Freedom Rider leaders to continue to protest segregation in bus terminals.

Supreme Court

June 5—In two 5-to-4 decisions, the Court upholds 2 major legislative weapons against communism. It sustains a section of the 1950 Internal Security Act requiring "Communist-action" organizations to register with the government and finds constitutional the clause of the 1940 Smith Act making it a crime to be a member of a party advocating the violent overthrow of the government.

June 12—The Court upholds the procedures of the A.E.C. for authorizing the construction and operation of nuclear power plants. It rejects, 7 to 2, arguments of

labor unions that the commission has not followed properly the safety regulations in the Atomic Energy Law in authorizing construction of an atomic power plant at Lagoon Beach, Michigan.

For the first time since 1958, the Court reverses a conviction for contempt of Congress. At issue was the refusal of a nuclear physicist to answer questions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities about other persons' Communist associations.

June 19—The Supreme Court rules that the Constitution forbids the use of illegally seized evidence in state criminal trials.

In a unanimous decision, the Court declares that the federal government or the states cannot compel public office-holder to declare a belief in God.

The Court upholds the federal government's right to dismiss a "security risk" employed by a contractor at a naval installation without notice or right to a hearing.

The Court declines to rule on Connecticut laws making it a crime to use birth control devices or for physicians to advise their use.

June 23—Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter grants a stay of the order directing the Communist party to register until the Court can study the plea for re-hearing.

VIETNAM, SOUTH

June 16—South Vietnam's chief cabinet minister Nguyen Dinh Thuan and U.S. officials complete 3 days of conferences in Washington. The U.S. agrees to increase the 685-man U.S. military advisory group to assign training specialists and to send U.S. officers into the field to observe troops in action. In addition to the \$40 million in arms previously promised, the U.S. agrees to pay salaries and will supply arms for 20,000 troops to be added to the 150,000-man army.

YUGOSLAVIA

June 15—Indonesian President Sukarno arrives in Belgrade for 2 days of talks with President Tito on details of the conference of uncommitted nations scheduled to start in Yugoslavia on September 1. (See also *United Arab Republic*.)

These CURRENT HISTORY issues are available for quantity purchase

Use this check list to order for your classes . . .

Problems in World Affairs

- Foreign Aid and Foreign Policy (9/57)
- The World of Islam (6/57)
- Canada (7/55)
- The Mediterranean World (8/55)
- The Far East in the Free World (7/56)
- Tensions in the British Community (6/58)
- Tensions in East-Central Europe (4/59)
- France and the Fifth Republic (5/59)
- Government and Labor Abroad (8/59)
- American Foreign Policy and the Communist World (10/59)
- Russian Foreign Policy and the Western World (11/59)
- Communist China as a World Power (12/59)
- West Germany as a World Power (1/60)
- U. S. Military Policy and World Security (4/60)
- Progress in the Middle East (5/60)
- World Federalism and Free World Security (8/60)
- West Europe and Continuing Coexistence (1/61)
- Nations of Latin America (4/61)
- Government and Education Abroad (6/61)

Problems of American Democracy

- United States Through Foreign Eyes (12/56)
- American Farm Leaders (6/55)
- Disarmament and Defense (10/57)
- Changing American Politics (8/56)
- Public Power in the U. S. (5/58)
- Security in a Free Society (10/55)
- Immigration and the American Ideal (11/55)
- Government and Labor in the U. S. (9/59)
- The American Economy (7/60)
- Regionalism in the U. S. (5/61)
- Government and Education in the U.S. (7/61)
- Problems of American Education (8/61)

Coming Soon

- China (9/61)
- Africa (10/61)
- The Soviet Union (11/61)
- Asia and South Asia (12/61)
- Foreign Policy of the Kennedy Administration (1/62)

Our Special Group Rates . . .

Because these studies are so helpful, we are now offering them at special reduced rates for group use: In orders of 5 or more copies of different issues, copies are available at 65¢ each; in orders of 5 or more copies of the same issue, at 50¢ each; 10 or more of the same issue, at 45¢; 30 or more of the same issue, at 40¢ each; 100 or more of the same issue, at 35¢ a copy. Single copy price, 85¢.

We also offer reduced rates for student subscriptions: in orders of 10 subscriptions or more, your students may subscribe for 9 months at \$4.05; or for 12 months at \$5.40; in orders of 30 or more, our 9 month rate is \$3.60; 12 months, \$4.80; in orders of 100 or more, our 9 month rate is \$3.15 and our 12 month rate is \$4.20. The cost of a single subscription is \$5.25 for 9 months; \$7.50 a year. See our special introductory offer on reverse side.

CH 861-3

CURRENT HISTORY

1822 Ludlow Street

Philadelphia 3, Penna.

I understand that I may order copies of these coordinated issues in quantity at special reduced rates. Please send me the issues I have indicated, in the quantities I have marked.

Name Check enclosed Bill me
Address 1 Year \$7.50 2 Years \$14
City plus 3 free issues plus 3 free issues

Keep Up To Date!

See what a **CURRENT HISTORY** subscription offers YOU!

****Month after month, our timely studies will keep you informed on vital topics.**

INTERESTING and KNOWLEDGEABLE REPORTS will round out your background information on such crucial matters as . . .

FREE WORLD SECURITY

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

PROGRESS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION

ABROAD

RUSSIAN FOREIGN POLICY

LATIN AMERICA

THE AMERICAN ECONOMY

WEST GERMANY AS A WORLD

POWER

Subscribe now to **CURRENT HISTORY**. EXCLUSIVE AND ORIGINAL STUDIES will provide you with invaluable, factual material that you can rely on for accuracy. Nowhere is such material duplicated. Nowhere are similar studies available at such low cost. **CURRENT HISTORY**'s continuing reference volumes are *one-of-a-kind!*

COORDINATED ISSUES contain seven or eight articles each month devoted to a pertinent topic in world affairs. Each of our contributors is a specialist in his field, who brings you his first-hand knowledge, background, impressions. Each article in an issue focuses on a different aspect of the subject for complete coverage of the complex problems of today's world.

CHRONOLOGY — The Month in Review offers a day-by-day account of the important events in all the countries of the world, both large and small. This is the only monthly chronology of its kind being published in the United States.

DOCUMENTS — Our documents section reprints the texts of important treaties, laws, diplomatic notes, speeches, to provide original source material. See how this material increases your understanding of how history is made.

BOOK REVIEWS — Comments on current books of interest to our readers bring you concise notes evaluating the latest publications in the field of history and politics.

AS A SPECIAL INTRODUCTORY BONUS, we will give you 3 free issues. Today, as Americans travel throughout the world, their need for background information on the problems of our century has increased one-hundred-fold. Concerned citizens everywhere are awakening to the fact that they must be prepared to meet ever-growing demands upon their insight and understanding.

3 FREE ISSUES

Your subscription to **CURRENT HISTORY** will include three coordinated studies **FREE**—Chosen from our List of Available Issues (see reverse side)—plus the next 12 issues for the usual yearly subscription price. Don't forget to select your 3 free gift copies from our list on the other side of this cover!

A GIFT FOR YOU WORTH \$2.55 Sign up today!
From **CURRENT HISTORY** • 1822 Ludlow Street • Phila. 3, Pa.

Name Address

City Zone State

Send me the following 3 gift copies:

12 months at \$7.50 plus 3 free issues 24 months at \$14 plus 3 free issues Check enclosed
 Bill me

Add 25¢ for Canada; 75¢ for foreign, including the Philippines.

CH 861-4